AUTUMN — 1954

Lutheran World

Vol. I, No. 3

Evanston GUSTAF WINGREN

Christ's Kingdom of Peace GERHARD GLOEGE

Faith in the Future and Hope of Eternal Life
RAGNAR BRING

Baptism, Conversion and Regeneration
AIMO T. NIKOLAINEN

A Visit to Finland HEINZ FLÜGEL

Lutheranism and the Historic Forces of South America HANNS LILJE

Publication
of the
LUTHERAN
WORLD
FEDERATION

CONTENTS

Page

Gustaf Wingren: Evanston 174
Gerhard Gloege: Christ's Kingdom of Peace 188
Ragnar Bring: Faith in the Future and Hope of Eternal Life 202
Aimo T. Nikolainen: Baptism, Conversion and Regeneration 213

THE ECUMENICAL WORLD

The Lutheran Contribution in Evanston (Carl E. Lund-Quist) 220

FROM THE WORK OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

Theology

Theological Conferences in America (Vilmos Vajta) 222

World Missions

Meeting of the Commission on World Missions in Hoekelum (Holland) October 22—29 (Hans Bolewski) 224
Study on the Transmission of our Faith as a constitutive Element in the Growth of the Younger Churches (Heinrich Meyer) 225
Comparative Studies on Constitutions of Younger Churches (Arvid Bäfverfeldt) 228

Commission on Stewardship and Congregational Life

The Work of Stewardship in the Lutheran Churches of Western Germany (Herbert Reich) 233
The Preaching-Teaching-Reaching Evangelism Mission (Conrad M. Thompson) 236

Committee on Latin America

The Second Latin American Lutheran Conference in Petropolis (Earl S. Erb) 238

FROM LANDS AND CHURCHES

South America

Lutheranism and the Historic Forces of South America (Hanns Lilje) 243

Finland

A Visit to Finland (Heinz Flügel) 246

Germany

The Revision of the Luther Bible: Tasks and Achievements (Heinz Brunotte) 249
Memorandum of the Ecumenical Commission of the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany 251
Review of the Activities of the Synod of the United Church 254

Post-Evanston Gleanings 256
Schedule of Meetings 1955 258
Our Contributors 259

LUTHERAN WORLD

PUBLICATION OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

Vol. I, No. 3 *Autumn 1954*

The things which the law of works demands by threats, the law of faith attains by this very faith. That is the wisdom which is called piety, in which we adore the Father of Light from whom proceeds each good endowment and every perfect gift. But He is worshipped in the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, lest the worshipper glorify himself rather than God. In the law of works God says: "Do what I have commanded"; but whoever stands under the law of faith will say to God: "Grant what Thou hast commanded." We have received not the spirit of this world, but the Spirit who is of God that we should know what God has bestowed upon us. But the spirit of this world is no other than the spirit of pride.

By precepts for a good life can no man be justified, but only by faith in Jesus Christ; that is, not by the law of works but by the law of faith, not by the letter but by the spirit, not by meritorious works but by undeserved grace alone.

AUGUSTINE, DE SPIRITO ET LITTERA

Look what great darkness there is in the fathers' books on faith. For if the article about justificatio (how to be devout and justified before God) is obscured, then it is impossible to subdue even the most grievous error. Hieronymus has written on Matthew, on the Epistles to the Galatians and to Titus. But how cold a thing it is! Ambrosius has written six volumes on Genesis; but how meagre they are! Augustine writes nothing notable about faith, except where he contends with the Pelagians; they awoke Augustine and made a man of him.

LUTHER, FROM THE TABLE TALKS OF 1538

GUSTAF WINGREN

Evanston*

We who travelled from Sweden to Evanston in August 1954 in order to attend the Second General Assembly of the World Council of Churches constantly had occasion at this conference to feel ourselves on familiar ground. Occasionally you actually felt carried back to your small homeland. The first words heard at the opening service were "A mighty fortress is our God", apparently sung in his native tongue by each member of the huge congregation. And after the last plenary session in McGaw Hall, the organ played the same chorale to accompany us on our way to the closing service. Eivind Berggrav preached the sermon at this service, and despite the English language, the Nordic intonation so familiar to us was ever present. He had chosen such hymns that on this occasion, especially, we imagined ourselves back home in Scandinavia. The main hymn of the service proved to be Beskow's "Ack saliga dag" ("O blessed day")[1] with the tune by Waldemar Rudin so well known to all of us.

Between such a beginning and such an ending much else occurred to fit completely into the frame just outlined. When Yngve Brilioth chaired the Assembly on the third day and gave the floor to Anders Nygren who was to report on the theological work of the Section "Faith and Order", the whole scene could have taken place in a Swedish town. And when, finally, the Archbishop of Canterbury greeted Dag Hammarskjöld, the General Secretary of the United Nations, and invited him to speak—twenty-four hours after President Eisenhower's visit — for the Swedes it was not a foreign guest from a faraway land who stepped up to the rostrum. This man had spent his youth in Uppsala and, indeed, he began his speech by recalling this time and the early impressions which he then gained of the growing ecumenical movement during Archbishop Söderblom's period of office.

Naturally there were many contrary impressions during the course of the Assembly, impressions of the strangeness or, rather, the pecu-

---

* This is a talk originally given on October 2 before the Theological Association at Lund, Sweden. Thanks to the kind permission of *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* which held original publication rights, it can here be printed simultaneously, in translation.

[1] The actual text of the English translation begins with "O jubilee day of the world's expectation" — *Cantate Domino* hymn 96 (1951 edition), transl. Charles Wharton Stork.

liarity represented by our country, and also of the limitation, sometimes almost of the poverty, of our problems and contrasts. 1,298 persons from 179 churches and 54 countries participated in the Assembly.

They represented mainly the following groups: 502 delegates, 499 accredited visitors, 145 consultants and 96 youth consultants. Altogether, 206 lay people participated, only 75 of them as delegates however; surely too small a number. The laity found its largest participation in the Swedish delegation where it constituted $^3/_8$ if you count Rector Anrup as a layman, $^2/_8$ if you count him as a theologian. The total number of women was 204 of which, again, only 44 were delegates; this, also, was much too low a figure.

Of course, on all important occasions, the audience was much larger than this. McGaw Hall is supposed to hold about 7,000 persons, and tickets for the available places were sold to the interested. In such a large, varied assembly we were confronted by problems quite different from our own. Conditions in the USA which actually differ considerably from our Swedish situation may nevertheless suddenly remind a Swede of home and appear quite familiar when he listens to an African or to a description of the situation in the Far East or in South America.

Thus Europeans found themselves in an alien world, and much could be said about this. The European churches who, like the German, had been most strongly affected by the anti-liberal tendencies during the period after the first world war, might well be mildly frightened in Evanston, in the face of a stale liberal theology such as can still be met here and there on North American soil. For a delegation such as the German, this doubtless could bring about a withdrawal into confessionalism, a turning in upon oneself, just as the Faith and Order conference of Lund in 1952 with its open communion apparently resulted in a stiffening of confessionalism among our southern neighbors. At any rate, such reactions and feelings were not noticeable among the Swedish participants. Should such reactions of distress, especially towards certain North American phenomena, appear in European commentaries on the Evanston conference, one might well ask whether they ought not to be completely reversed and construed in favor of the other side. For it is quite possible that the most powerful historical effect produced by Evanston 1954 might have been the local one, that is, the effect of the conference upon the North American churches themselves.

Unquestionably, the conference met with extraordinary interest of press and public, both locally and in the whole United States. An ecumenical meeting in Stockholm would certainly not have had such

an ecumenical hinterland and therefore could have played only a minor role in Swedish church history. I also have no idea what an ecumenical gathering in Switzerland would have to do in order to persuade a farmer in the area of the Château de Bossey or a citizen of Geneva to take his eyes off his daily work. But Evanston seems to have captured the imagination of the ordinary, average American. Undoubtedly this is due in part to the flourishing variety of denominations in that country and to the fact that the press has continuously shown strong interest in church activities. On such soil the conference found very different conditions than would have been the case in Europe with its wide-spread state-church system. Certainly the American public is often confused by theologies such as the Barthian from Germany, but, on the other hand, it is a public with a thirst for theology and will naturally absorb even many of the things about which it has doubts[2].

If you want to gain an impression of what occurred at the conference, it might be best to remind yourself of all the things which did not take place. In this connection one must note, first of all, that no serious attempt was made to tackle the printed preparatory study documents. Those of us who for three years had worked on the main theme in the Advisory Commission, now had to face the fifteen discussion groups and their questions. Sometimes we felt like high-school students just before teacher returns a corrected paper. But such concern was quite unnecessary. Nothing essential occurred. No true sallies against the documents materialized and even the Assembly's comments were, finally, rather lame. Secondly, it was remarkable that there was no political clash between East and West. Many had feared this, especially after reactionary forces in the United States, not connected with the churches, had rendered some rather unpleasant examples of their lack of judgment on a certain occasion in the spring of 1954. But nothing happened. There were East German, Hungarian and Czech delegates, and all spoke their mind. The American public was so wary of its own Old Adam that Professor Hromadka from the other side of the Iron Curtain was applauded beyond the merits of his talk. After many such demonstrations of politeness, a somewhat thoughtful listener could, finally, not avoid some uneasiness very different from that with which he originally had approached the conference. This new anxiety could perhaps be

[2] Edmund Schlink's lecture on the Main Theme. The Christian Hope, on the first day of the Assembly was a good example of this theology which both shocks the American public and impresses it, despite all the reactions which got abroad. Nonetheless, it was extremely useful to have Robert L. Calhoun follow immediately upon Schlink with an exposition of the theme from points of view familiar to the American audience. A reverse order of the two talks would have been even more fortunate.

expressed by asking: were not those from the East who were not present and who in the year 1954 represent perhaps the most sterling treasure of Christendom, all too often forgotten at Evanston? But naturally, people were glad of the unity. It is indeed surprising that the sections on social questions and international affairs, made up of so many different delegates, ever reached agreement. The joint declaration on the race question, too, was a positive surprise, considering the composition of the conference.

If you now ask what actually did happen, the answer will first of all point to the Assembly's decision on the organization of the World Council. How the daily work of such a group is carried out is more important than any questions brought up by its appearance in the public eye. Decisions on organization do, of course, determine all the work of the days and weeks before the next meeting, they are basic for the on-going work of the staff and the departments. This work, after all, represents the foundation of those large Assemblies which, indeed, arouse the attention of the Press but which inevitably are, to a certain degree, a conglomeration of both well and poorly oriented people. A committee under the direction of Dr. Leslie E. Cooke prepared a Recommendation on Structure and Functioning of the Council for the Evanston conference which must be counted among the best-thought-out pieces of work presented during the whole meeting. I gained the impression that, with regard to organization, Amsterdam represented merely the first pangs of birth and that the baby was not properly brought to light and to some extent freed of its umbilical cord until Evanston[3]. According to the Recommendation, three divisions will now be created: the Division of Studies, to which very particular interest attaches, the Division of Ecumenical Action which, among other things, is to promote effective liaison between work on the ecumenical level and life in the local congregation, something which has been neglected hitherto and is likely to require large sums of money, as will the third division, that of Inter-Church Aid and Service to Refugees. Among the various departments attached to these three divisions should be noted the Department of Information which has received increasing attention. The Secretariat has been enlarged as well. The Ecumenical Institute at Bossey will occupy a more central position in the general framework than hitherto, though this will, of course, depend largely upon the person who will direct the Institute in the future.

[3] "To some extent" ought still to be stressed. Apparently, relationships to Faith and Order and to the International Missionary Council have still not been definitely determined. More will be said about this later on.

The composition of the Secretariat shows ever more clearly the universal character of the World Council of Churches. America and East Asia appear with independent centers next to old Europe and its suburb, Geneva. Vital, permanent patterns of work capable of further development are being established in these places. The new beginnings in East Asia were the subject of detailed consideration in Evanston. Bishop Bell of Chichester, the retiring chairman of the Central Committee, rendered highest praise to the work contributed in East Asia by Dr. Rajah Manikam of India, when he gave his report on the past six years. Apparently, the ecumenical conference of January 1953 in Lucknow, India, attended, of course, also by representatives of our northern countries, was of special importance for this part of the world. During one of the evening events held in the course of the Evanston conference, Manikam himself gave a fascinating account of the situation in South East Asia.

Manikam's work is one of the factors which most strongly contributed to the mutual understanding between the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council. And here we have come to the unification and merger now apparent in many phases of ecumenical work, work which was formerly divided into different spheres and among various organizations. With regard to this growing-together of the work, the first division of the World Council, the Division of Studies, is of special interest. It consists of four departments: the sub-sections for Faith and Order, for Evangelism, for Church and Society, and for Missionary Studies. Here, one must note first of all that Faith and Order now merely forms a sub-section within the Studies Division of the Council, a loss of independence which, from the viewpoint of Faith and Order itself, would have been thought impossible less than ten years ago. Of course, this work retains a certain measure of independence even today, within the framework given it by the Council. Among other things, the large international Commission on Faith and Order is retained. Yngve Brilioth will continue to chair it, and it will meet every three years. Something more will be said about it later on. Nevertheless it is doubtful whether Faith and Order conferences such as that of Lausanne in 1927 will be held again. At any rate it should take a long time before the next one materializes.

More interesting even than Department 1 is Department 4, Missionary Studies. For this fourth sub-section of the Division of Studies is financially and administratively a branch of the International Missionary Council. Here, too, it must be noted that the International Missionary Council—to the extent that it engages in theological or

other study—has become part of the World Council of Churches. Thus Faith and Order and the International Missionary Council coalesce with the main line of ecumenism. In some respects they renounce their own existence for the sake of the common good. Naturally, marks of the original organizations remain in many ways even in the newly-created study departments. Possibly yet another General Assembly must assist the child to fully independent life.

Undoubtedly the merging of these four departments with such very different origins into one Division of Studies would be helped along considerably if all four were to choose a common theme for their set task. The formulation of such a "general theme" was indeed vigorously discussed by the committee which at Evanston had to deliberate upon future work, but no agreement on it could be reached. The only theme which was formulated into a recommendation was "the Mission of the Church in the World". This formula would maintain the special tasks of the four departments and bring them to a common denominator. Moreover, it would surely do no harm if the Church's relation to the world were to be more clearly understood within ecumenism. The slogan of the Oxford conference, 1937, "Let the Church be the Church!" has frequently led to self-satisfaction, as if it were sufficient to be a church somewhere up in the air, without ever asking what purpose the church was to fulfil in God's creation. Clear and wholesome criticism of this "ecclesiocentricity" was expressed in Visser't Hooft's report the second day of the Assembly.

But enough of this. It should be clear from the above-said that such organizational changes of extraordinary importance constitute a first answer to the question of what happened at Evanston. Secondly, something specific should be said, in this connection, about personnel changes. All six incumbent presidents handed over their office in accordance with the basic principles of the Constitution[4]. Brilioth had moved the possible re-election of presidents, but this was not carried. Leslie Cooke's motion finally prevailed. Surely it would have been of value to retain the Archbishop of Canterbury, for example, in the Presidium. I wonder whether among the new presidents—for whose office six new candidates now have to be found every seven years—there will be one capable of greeting a Head of

[4] The resigning presidents — because of Sarah Chakko's death there were only five — were: Berggrav, Boegner, Oxnam, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Archbishop Athenagoras. The six new ones are: South American Bishop Barbiere (Methodist), Metropolitan Juhanon (Mar Thoma Church of India), Archbishop Michael (head of the Greek-Orthodox Church in America, living in New York), Bishop Sherrill (Anglican, New York), Dibelius from Berlin, and Principal Baillie of Edinburgh who for a long time has actively contributed to the work of the ecumenical movement. Thus two of the presidents live in New York; only two are Europeans.

State as worthily and regally as Geoffrey Fisher received Eisenhower? Evidently it is best, for the moment, to allow the representative principle to run its course, since today it is so much in the forefront at any election, before choosing other standards. This principle is unfortunate where the choice of presidents is concerned, and the sooner it fails, the sooner a new way can be found. For the Presidium one should select personalities who have served the ecumenical movement long and faithfully but who, because of the burden of work laid upon them by their own churches, no longer find it possible to concern themselves continuously with the daily grind of international relations; the election of such people should take place without regard to their confessional loyalty. Such presidents should certainly be able to represent ecumenical work with firmness and emphasis. At present, in Evanston, we are faced with a system of figureheads carried to its extreme, and we can only hope that this pitcher will soon go to the well once too often.

The uncertainty in the position of the presidents was underlined by the fact that two Honorary Presidents elected for life, John R. Mott and George Bell, were set above them. Below them they have the ninety members of the Central Comittee, twenty-three of whom were re-elected at Evanston. The most important election, however, did not take place until after the conference when the Central Committee chose for its chairman, in replacement of Bell, the American Lutheran Franklin Fry, well known to all of us for his work in the Lutheran World Federation. Much could be added on the topic of personnel. Nils Ehrenström is about to lay down his office in Geneva, with Sweden unable to find an appropriate place for him. In Evanston we walked about with a feeling of shame, whenever we thought of it. Other changes among the staff would be worth discussing in detail, but we shall leave it at this brief incursion.

If we now turn from questions of organization and personnel to theological problems, we come to what should have been the principal concern. And, judging by interest, by the intensity of the discussions or the time sacrified to them, theology was indeed the principal concern at Evanston. In the fifteen discussion groups on the main theme — "Christ — the Hope of the World" — as well as in the six sections, theology was debated, and that by all, scholars and non-scholars alike, with remarkable frankness. It is just a little difficult to distil concrete results from so many talks. However, one could say that on the whole the discussion moved around the study documents, and Evanston's most important theological contribution after all the debates, actually still consists of the basic documents

published as early as June 1954. In other words, the most important development did not occur during the conference at all but had already taken place earlier. This, however, might well be a general experience for gatherings of this size. It is, of course, quite impossible to maintain the level of those small, well-disciplined preparatory conferences dominated by experts, among a crowd of over 1,000 people. From the very beginning one has to limit his expectations of conference results by the realization that it is quite an achievement if such a huge assembly can even be drawn into the debate on theological documents as weighty as the seven study documents. First, there was the report on Christian Hope, then the six reports addressed to the six sections of the conference: unity, evangelism, social questions, international relations, race question, and vocation. Not published until June 1954, these papers are so new that they would merit detailed review[5]. Actually, they were completed in September 1953, after the conclusion of the preparatory work at Bossey, but could neither be published nor reviewed the year preceding Evanston. This is, unfortunately, not the occasion to deal with the study documents since we are concerned primarily with establishing the importance of the actual assembly itself.

The theological disagreement which arose in section 6, inquiring into the meaning of work, appeared more violent to me than the manifold conflicts which occurred during the inquiry after the meaning of Hope. This debate was only ended because the General Assembly finally asked two Departments jointly to undertake, once again, an examination into "the Christian understanding of work"[6]. Nevertheless, section 6 produced an important, well-written report on "the Christian in his Vocation". The differences within the section concerned two diverging conceptions of the Church's situation, probably somewhat characteristic of the countries from which they sprang. The interest of the Americans was directed towards winning lay people for the Church by having them participate actively in the congregation's work. On the other hand, continental Europe regarded the layman as a sleeping member within the Church and inquired after the task of the alert Christian layman in society and everyday life. American interest expresses itself in the slogan about "stewardship". The European concern was chiefly supported by Reinold von Thadden. This, indeed, is the point at which the "Evangelical Kirchentag"

[5] On the main problem in the reports on Hope, *cf.* G. Wingren, "Eschatological Hope and Social Action", *Lutheran World*, Vol. I, 1, pp. 18, ff.

[6] See also the American symposium *Work and Vocation*, ed. John Oliver Nelson, Harper & Brothers, New York 1954, with contributions, among others, by Robert L. Calhoun and Paul S. Minear.

in Germany has directed itself with a real passion. It was the European approach which finally carried the day in this section. As to the problems of the other sections, the only insight I myself could gain came through the statements presented to the Plenary Session, and as a rule these were rather summary[7].

The debate left a somewhat bitter aftertaste at one point, though it concerned, as is usual in such cases, a mere detail. The General Assembly left untouched the printed document to the main theme, but it drew up a Statement containing a critique. On that occasion, quite a few expressed the wish that the Jews, that is, Israel's inclusion in the last days according to Romans 9—11, should be mentioned specifically in a report on Christ as the Hope of the world. Others, among them the majority of the Swedes, were of the opinion that through such a statement one single eschatological "sign" would be isolated over against the many other signs also referred to by the New Testament which the Assembly apparently was less inclined to mention. The proposed section on Israel finally was rejected. The German delegation, with the evil memory of the days of anti-semitism still clearly in their minds, tended to regard this vote as a betrayal of Israel. It is a fact that during the debate a number of bad arguments, some of them political, were brought out in favor of the side which carried the vote. The Presidium was led to the reminder, in this connection, that the council had already made its position on the Jewish question very clear. Evanston was concerned with hope, not with Israel; the problem under discussion was merely whether, in this, Israel should be named especially; but that was a matter of opinion and not a question of principle. Nonetheless, an American daily paper announced the next morning that the World Council of Churches had rejected Mission among Jews. Clearly, the decision was especially painful to the representatives of Jewish missions; there were many who feared that misunderstandings of this kind would continue to crop up for a long time in debates on Evanston, particularly since Jewish missions have many friends precisely in those circles which are rather sceptical of the ecumenical movement for other reasons. There is nothing one can do about this. It will be best simply to interpret the decision correctly in the face of future questions and doubts. Its anti-Jewish interpretation certainly has no basis whatever but is pure fabrication[8].

[7] The division into Main Theme and sub-themes is clearly discernible in the "Message" which the Conference sent out. Possibly this message has become somewhat unwieldy by endeavoring to touch upon everything that was discussed.

[8] But the opposite, as it were, pro-Jewish, interpretation is also incorrect: namely, that Jewish and Christian faith are so similar that any special mission to the Jews must be

But all such matters are essentially trifles and superficialities when compared with the actual sore which plagues ecumenism, the lack of a common Communion Table. The so-called clashes were rather harmless. The large festering sore was not created by such conflicts but by the unspoken yet profound disunity borne by many without batting an eye, almost as a matter of course — one is tempted to say, without shame. The fact that there were no really violent clashes surely was partially due to the absence of a considerable number of critical voices. Many colorful personalities who had been expected did not attend the meeting. Karl Barth was missing, as were Emil Brunner and Reinhold Niebuhr. The absence of eruptions of theological ire resulting from such non-appearances was a deplorable deficiency. At times, it seemed as if the spirit of a fatal conformity were descending upon the assembly. The Church of Rome was more absent than she had been at Amsterdam; this time she no longer even sent an observer. This, too, deprived the total panorama of a further essential impetus to tension[9]. The International Council of Christian Churches, a body organized in protest against the World Council of Churches, ought to have been in Evanston for its criticism to be heard. Instead, it held its congress a few days before Evanston in distant Philadelphia, and not a single Evanston participant appeared to waste even a single thought on the mere existence of this counter-organization, just as Eisenhower simply overlooked the request not to visit the questionable Assembly at Evanston handed to him from this quarter in a detailed document. In fact, the Assembly lacked colorful and vital contrasts in more than one respect.

Yet walls existing between the various groups asserted themselves with sufficient obtrusiveness even while most of the debates in the General Assembly barely let you suspect any real passion. Above all, they obtruded themselves in the non-existence of a common Communion Table. Granted, the conference participants were invited to various celebrations of the Lord's Supper. Here, the Anglican invitation presented a surprise, since never before had it been sent with such open sincerity. To be sure, some disapproving voices were raised in the Anglican camp against the open form in which their confession had extended the invitation to the Sacrament, just as in 1952 a small group of Swedish ministers opposed the open Com-

offensive to them. True, liberal Americans argued this way in the debate; but the point at issue was not Jewish missions at all, but what a document on Hope should look like and what issues must be mentioned in such a document.

[9] However, a group of Roman-Catholic theologians did participate, in writing, in the debate on Hope. *Cf.* the journal *Istina*, 1954, II, pp. 132—158. *Istina* has published a special English offprint of this contribution under the title "Christ, the Church and Grace in the Economy of Christian Hope: Roman Catholic Views on the Evanston Theme".

munion celebrated in Lund Cathedral on the occasion of the Conference on Faith and Order. Nonetheless, the Table was prepared, and it was accessible to all, just as in Lund. The actual conference Communion was Methodist, the inviting congregation being First Methodist Church. The attitude of the hosts was, by the way, exemplary in every respect, not only as regards the service. The Lutheran Church also extended an invitation to Communion, as did the Church of South India and India's Mar Thoma Church—the latter also without any conditions. And, finally, the conference participants were invited to "attend" a Greek Orthodox Communion. The problem was, by no means, lack of opportunity to commune. Rather, it consisted in the silent aloofness of large and significant groups of participants. Under the surface of many friendly speeches, one of the profoundest problems of the ecumenical movement remained, as ever, unsolved. Saying this, one dare not, on the other hand, leave unmentioned something else: namely that worship services are the strongest unifying factor at such conferences. This positive judgment was equally true at Evanston. Common prayer and confession and the hearing of the Word of Scripture are still able to unite all minds; and in this unity one hears not the churches, but the Church.

With regard to future meetings, convocation of the next General Assembly for 1960 was approved. Invitations from two countries, Greece and Japan, had already been submitted. But judging by remarks heard almost up to the end of the conference, the meeting in 1960 might very easily take place somewhere else entirely.

It seemed as if certain morals were drawn from Evanston for future General Assemblies. It is not likely that the year 1960 will see debates over the extent to which theological documents should be "accepted". The theological papers prepared in connection with the conference will probably be submitted as pure study documents from the very beginning, and thus majority votes in matters of faith will be avoided. Doubts were raised against retaining the system of one main theme and several sub-themes. Already during the preparatory period before Evanston, the participants had learned that this complicates the whole procedure and makes it cumbersome.

The General Assembly, August 17 to 31, was followed by several further meetings. An unofficial gathering from September 1 to 3 took on, once again, the topic of church unity, in continuation of the conversation which followed the Faith and Order Conference at Lund. These confidential discussions may not be reported here. Let it merely be said that the newly-created structure in South India, and the projected church unions of a similar nature in North India and

Ceylon, dominated the talks. The Anglicans' attitude towards these new church creations continuously held the attention of the participants. There was much to learn, here, for an outsider.

The large international Commission for Faith and Order was convened from September 3 to 7 under Archbishop Brilioth's direction at McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago. This group, essentially made up of about 80 theological experts, had held a session previous to the General Assembly, as did the comparatively small Working Committee. But the actual meeting of the Commission did not take place until the first week of September. There was much brisk theological discussion, very thorough and no longer disturbed by preparatory work for the General Assembly. Brilioth was unanimously re-elected as chairman for the next three-year period. He let it be known, however, that after that he wished to be freed of this charge.

The young systematician Thomas F. Torrance from Edinburgh became a dominant figure in this circle. True, he looks like a schoolboy; but he commands a more thorough education than most. He is a pupil of Cullmann's, and his original field of study was Patristics. At the same time, he bears the stamp of the Scotch ecumenical spirit and is oriented towards Biblical theology, with a decided concern for practical matters: Intercommunion in several directions for the Church of Scotland is one of the goals towards which he directs his efforts. He is, in a word, a man who fits splendidly into the new form which the work on Faith and Order was given after Lund 1952[10]. You can be critical of much that he says and writes, yet you cannot but take him seriously. Another participant who attracted considerable attention is A. N. Ramsay, Bishop of Durham. He has become known in the North by a whole series of books, and he is spokesman for an Anglican wing of decidedly high-church tendencies. Clearly he is one of those who are not satisfied with the new course upon which Faith and Order has embarked during the last two years and would therefore like to return this branch of ecumenical work to its former condition.

As previously indicated, one should not count on a large Faith and Order meeting such as Lund in the foreseeable future. Instead, gatherings like the one in Chicago are likely to be held every few years. With that, the theological center of gravity has moved into the standing study committees set up in 1953 and 1954. Since then, these have worked at the tasks determined at the time. What these

[10] *Cf.* T. F. Torrance, "Where do we go from Lund?" *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 1953, (Vol. 6, I) pp. 53—64, & "The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church", *ibid.* 1954 pp. 1—25 (special printing with separate pagination).

committees and small theological commissions will publish during the next decade may well determine the future of Faith and Order. Judging by this summer's Chicago talks, it looks as if different views about the purpose of their set tasks have penetrated the organization's various committees and seem to have gained a permanent foothold. Inevitably, the internal tensions thus created must come out into the open some day, as all the committees strive to present studies which can be published. Let me therefore conclude the report of this year's meetings in the United States with a few words on these conflicts and the prospects for the future. Faith and Order's first subcommission, rather restricted in size, deals with the topic "Christ and His Church". It is divided into two sections: one in Europe, led by Anders Nygren, and the other, in America, led by Robert Calhoun. Not only is the European section chaired by Nygren, it also has the above-mentioned Torrance as secretary. In addition, this small European group of eleven persons includes such theologians as Cullmann, Schlink, and Watson. It is their task to analyze "the concept of the Church" on the basis of Christology and Biblical testimony. This implies a return to the New Testament's message about Christ, from whence the Church will then be approached. From the beginning, the latter is viewed as one, as a unity given, not still to be created by us. This insight will never grant normative character to church order and separate doctrines within church-groupings now existing, but will always view them as subservient to the norm created by the biblical Christological starting-point. Despite its simplicity this means a completely new beginning for the work of Faith and Order, in contrast to the earlier practice of c o m p a r i s o n. Then, the points of entry were the present denominations, the Anglicans, Lutherans, Orthodox, or Reformed, which were simply compared, the depths of the underlying biblical scheme never being reached.

A most promising preliminary discussion of this commission had taken place in Evanston previous to the General Assembly. From August 6 to 11, before the great invasion began and while everything was still quiet in town, the European and American sections of the theological "Commission on Christ and His Church" met jointly under Calhoun's direction. Only three Europeans, Nygren, Torrance and this writer, were present during most of these talks; American theologians constituted the overwhelming majority. This turned the splendid collaboration between Europeans and Americans into an even greater surprise. The Commission's capacities are undeniable, as is the potential it presents for following up the new direction of this

branch of Faith and Order. Joint conferences of both sections have been scheduled for 1957 and 1960. The European section intends to hold an annual Workshop in Europe which next year will probably take place in Lund.

But there are other subcommittees[11]. The committee which had been handed the topic of worship and which thus constitutes the meeting ground of liturgical specialists was given new directions for its future work at Chicago. Numerically, this group has grown to an unexpected degree[12]. In the future, this field will thus concern a much larger number of people than any other. That still leaves open the question of what has happened to the point of departure, the New Testament. Treating the Orders of Worship of certain confessions as normative in questions of faith is a disease apparently more widespread among scholars of liturgy than other professions. The talks on this subject, in Chicago, did not give the impression that Faith and Order had changed very much at this point. The above-named Ramsay is chairman of the European section of the liturgical committee. Prenter was elected its deputy chairman, and Vilmos Vajta is among the members.

One should not be too sure that Faith and Order has actually "changed its spots". The only thing that can really be said is that one of its committees, the Commission on Christ and His Church, is making the attempt to open up the question of the unity of the Church from a different angle than hitherto. It remains to be seen what result this experiment may one day have for the total work of Faith and Order.

But then—finally returning from the Chicago meeting to the General Assembly in Evanston—it is equally uncertain what kind of a role Faith and Order as a whole will play within the new Division of Studies. Organizationally, we are confronted by an extension of this work unprecendented in the ecumenical movement. It will take a few years, until the machinery runs smoothly, before new shapes and structures will appear more clearly defined.

[11] *Cf.* G. Wingren, "Det teologiska arbetet inom World Council" (Theological Work in the World Council), *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*, 1953, IV. pp. 301—303. The most important committee, also divided into an European and an American section, deals with the concept of Tradition. The sections are headed by Prof. K. E. Skydsgaard and Dr. A. C. Outler, respectively.

[12] This committee is now subdivided into four sections for Europe, America, Asia, and Australia.

GERHARD GLOEGE

Christ's Kingdom of Peace*

"All the world longs for peace"[1]. This longing is the one common bond which, nowadays, unites torn mankind. An entirely elementary, almost banal will demands the floor: the will to live, the thirst for existence. People today say: we want to live, quite simply: live! We want to work. "Where we sowed the seedlings green, the golden grain we want to glean"[2]. We do not want to die! We do not want to let our children bleed to death ever again, on the world's battlefields, in a meaningless cause. We do not build houses in order to be buried by their ruins. Our little bit of happiness, the wretched remains of "culture", our poor fragment of humanity shall not be shattered yet again!

The call for peace has become especially urgent because the phenomenon of war has now grown into the immeasurable. The word "war" no longer covers the aspect of "war". Up to now, some relative sense could be granted even to frightful wars[3]. Up to now, you could gain something by war. Today you can only lose something! Hitherto, you could defend or conquer something by war. Freedom and fatherland were defended, a position of power, or bare existence. And: one achieved fame, lands, raw material supplies, trade connections, markets. Today, under the sign of atomic energy, war seems finally to have lost its function to serve the life of a people. Today defense means—self-destruction. The sense (Sinn) of a future war would, obviously, be insanity (Wahn-Sinn): suicide of the nations! Hitherto, old orders were broken in war, while new ones arose. In the next war, all order would become chaos, with no cosmos left to face it.

Admittedly: humanity's longing for peace is an ancient one. It is older than Israel's hope! Human myths about world peace pre-date the biblical Promise. Already the peoples of the ancient orient conjure up

---

* This article was first presented as a talk during the German Evangelical *Kirchentag* held in Leipzig, East Germany, in July 1954. This explains, among other things, the several quotations from songs current in Germany's eastern zone.

[1] From the National Anthem of the German Democratic Republic (DDR), (i. e. East Germany), by Johannes R. Becher, the second verse.

[2] From: "El Segadors"—The Reapers, after a Catalan peasant hymn, by Ernst Busch, *Ein Lied lasst uns singen! Internationale Kampflieder* (Let us sing a Song! International Battle Songs), p. 86.

[3] "For if the sword were not on guard to preserve peace (!), everything in the world must go to ruins because of lack of peace. Therefore, *such a war* (a defensive war) is only a *little, brief lack of peace*, that prevents an everlasting and immeasurable lack of peace, a small misfortune that prevents a great misfortune." Martin Luther, *Works*, Philadelphia: A. J. Halman Company, 1931. Vol. V. p. 36.

the lost age of origin in visions of the "golden age" which is to follow the "brazen" one. A Sumerian text, almost five thousand years old, depicts in luxuriant colors the former peace in the land of the gods: peace between beast and beast, and between beast and man[4]. Once the world was healthy through and through, safe in the happiness of the gods.

But people also knew: the lost paradise will return. With more than one ruler's accession did they expect the beginning of the new era[5] and, with it, that of justice. The Babylonian king Hammurabi knows himself to be called by the gods "by name to make the law count for something in the land, to destroy the wicked and the evil ones, that the strong might not harm the weak"[6]. — The ancient world expected peace as a tangible reality on earth. It knew: if peace should come, it would not merely silence the weapons of war. For, at the same time, misery must give way to happiness and force to justice, in an all-embracing world-order. The history of nations is written in blood. Yet not blood shall have the last word, but peace.

I. PROMISE

Into this world of classic peace-manifestos and peace-organizers, God pronounces His promise of peace. God promises His kingdom of peace[7]. This is the first fact. And this first event is anything but self-evident. For this God, the God of Israel, is a King, a warrior, a war-hero. The category of His action is—battle! He comes as the "Lord of hosts" as "the Lord, strong and mighty, the Lord, mighty in battle!"

---

[4] "The place is pure, is spotless. Not a sound from raven or songbird. The lion did not yet kill. The wolf did not steal lambs. No dog would approach a kid. No animal yet knew its trap-net, no bird of the sky knew its snare. No sick eye in that place did say: 'I am a sick eye.'" This quotation based on W. Eichrodt, *Die Hoffnung des ewigen Friedens im alten Israel* (The Hope of Eternal Peace in Ancient Israel) *Beiträge zur Förderung der christlichen Theologie* (BFTh), 25. 3 (1920), p. 65, n. 2.

[5] With the dawn of the new age the gods return the great happiness of the days of origin. Thus the Assyrian King Assurbanipal celebrates the start of his reign as the beginning of that time of blessing. Since the gods—so he tells us on an ancient clay cylinder—"have placed me on the throne of my father, my procreator" they have allowed their rain to fall. "Thus the grain grew to a height of five ells in the ear, the ear being five to six ells long; the harvest was good, the grain grew abundantly, the orchards grew luxuriant fruit, the cattle brought forth their young successfully. During my reign opulence descended abundantly, during my years rich blessings flowed." Based on W. Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

[6] Hammurabi, the most active organizer of the ancient Orient, "from the beginning compared his reign to Marduk's taking over the rule of the universe, and the foundation of Babylon" and proclaims the words quoted in the text in the preface to the codex of laws named after him. ". . . in order to advance the welfare of mankind I am the one called by Bel, called Hammurabi the Prince by name, pouring out wealth and overabundance. . ." Based on W. Eichrodt, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

[7] For Section I, *cf.* esp. the work quoted in note 4 which deals critically with about 20 eschatological texts, and analyses them theologically. Most of these were used as a basis for the section. I should like to name the most important ones, for *personal study:* Is. 32:15—20; 29:17—21; 9:1—6; 11:1—9; 2:2—4; Zach. 9:1—10; Hos. 2:16—25; 14:5—9; Amos 9:13—15; Num. 23:18—24; 24:5—9; Gen. 49:8—12; Mic. 5:1—4; Ps. 46; Is. 19:18—25; Zeph. 3:9—10; 3:11—13; if you would grasp the proclamation which unfolds in these texts, try to study them with

(Psalm 24.) The congregation which He chose was born out of the depth of warlike events. She is His levy, His militia. The vocation of ancient Israel is war!

Whoever knows the Old Testament will know how "unashamedly"[8] war is waged in that book. And, indeed, with a good conscience! Under God's command! In ancient Israel, "holy war" is a sacred institution[9]. Not every war is a "holy war". Wars which the kings of Israel lead under their own auspices are rebellion against God. But the "holy war" stands in the center of worship life: it is not Israel which defends God; rather, God Himself enters the field for the protection of Israel. Small bands under leaders with the gift of the spirit put themselves at God's disposal as His assistants, called to fearless faith: God will let His cause be victorious! Israel's wars are carried out with all the atrocities and cruelty familiar to the ancient history of warfare. And in psalms of vengeance (Ps. 137) God's help against the enemy is implored.

"Holy War" had already had its day in Israel. But in the great prophecies, the contemplation of this divine institution awoke to new life. It was spiritually reshaped by prophetic preaching. First Isaiah saw "all of God's action in history in the shape of holy war"[10]. God alone has the initiative. He excludes all human self-assertion [11].

But something else must be remembered. In God's hand war becomes a means of chastizing Israel. War, indeed, is ever a happening brought about by men. But the nations are God's instruments by which He executes his judgment of wrath, even against Israel. Thus war is one of the four great scourges—together with famine, pestilence, and wild beasts—by which God punishes the nations' wantonness (Jer. 15:1—3; 43:11; Ezekiel 6:11—12; 5:15—17; 14:12—23; Leviticus 26; *cf.* Rev. 6:8). It is the slogan "peace, peace" with which God's judgment is denied, by which Jeremiah recognizes the—false prophets! (Jer. 8:11.)

Truly, it is anything but obvious that such a God does promise peace! Nevertheless, that is what He does. Against the dark background of the sky of judgment, looming in thunder-clouds over all the earth,

---

the help of a good translation (even without special linguistic or historical knowledge) with the following four questions in mind: a) *who* brings on the Time of Salvation? God or the Messiah? b) *to whom* has this Time of Salvation been promised? to Israel? or also to the nations? c) how will the Time of Salvation be realized? in a warlike or a peaceful manner? d) *what* is the content of the Time of Salvation? the plenty of paradise or the peace of righteousness? That is—in the distinction made later on: is it concerned with the heart of the promise, or the outer frame? Please note how the answers will rarely be exclusive, but will blend, with different accents and on different levels. Any reader who follows things up should find the labor here suggested well worth his while.

[8] Karl Barth's expression in *Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie* (The Word of God and Theology), 1924.

[9] Gerhard v. Rad, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel* (Holy War in Ancient Israel), 1951. *Cf.* Otto Plöger's review in *Verkündigung und Forschung*, Part 3 (1952) pp. 179—185.

[10] Gerhard v. Rad, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

[11] But even in an eschatological passage of the book of Micah, God's Congregation is challenged to participate in God's action: "Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion, for I will make your horn iron and your hoofs bronze; you shall beat in pieces many peoples."

the true magnitude of God's promise is, finally, comprehensible. The very prophets who announce the doom of God's judgment proclaim His salvation at the same time. God's purposes are not the purposes of war, but the purposes of peace (Jer. 29:11). And His peace aims imply a kingdom of lasting peace. Men cannot bring it about. He Himself is going to do that (Zechariah 9:1—10; Ps. 46; Is. 19:18—25). In the decisive moment He will wrest the power from the hands of statesmen and military leaders (Is. 9:1—6; Zephaniah 3:11). He will prevail with His very own rule, even though He delegates His power to one person: to His anointed, His messiah. This divine king will be a king of peace (Is. 9:1—6; 11:1—9), meek, overcoming chaos and war without weapons (Zech. 9:1—10), not a mighty hero of war, but God's "peacemaker" (Gen. 49:10).

God pledges His kingdom of peace otherwise than do oriental gods and their protégés, otherwise than Marduk and Hammurabi, otherwise also than Virgil and Horace[12]. For He makes manifest two basic elements in His promise: a universal one which embraces all creation—and a central one which specifically concerns mankind. God's promise contains, as it were, a general framework and a core program.

The framework applies to the whole world. It includes the promise of paradise. God accepts the longing of the nations. The time of the scourges of God will come to an end. Famine, pestilence, wild beasts, war shall be done away with (Is. 32:15; 29:17; Hos. 2:23—24; 14:4—9; Amos 9:13—15, Num. 24:6—7; Gen. 49:11—12; Is. 11:6; Hos. 2:18). Man will be relieved of the constant threat to his existence. God Himself will put an end to wars in all the world. He Himself will destroy all weapons of attack and defense: "He breaks the bow and shatters the spear, he burns the chariots with fire" (Ps. 46:9). God will thoroughly spoil men's pleasure in war: "they shall not learn war any more." Weapons of war shall be beaten into the tools of peace (Is. 2:4).

But all this is only the general promise — the promise of great happiness, of returning paradise. At the center is the core-promise: God promises His kingdom of peace by promising His righteousness, His justice. Just as peace is a gift, so is His righteousness. God's justice is the very essence of all His help to mankind. Only out of righteousness will peace be born! But righteousness means: Men shall become capable of communion with God and, at the same time, capable of communion one with the other. God promises this double capacity for

[12] Virgil's Fourth Eclogue, as for instance transcribed after Rud. Al. Schröder by Eth. Stauffer, *Christus und die Caesaren* (Christ and the Caesars), (1948), pp. 77—80. Also the historical sketches "Eine verfrühte Adventsfeier" (An Anticipated Advent Celebration), pp. 81 ff. and "Augustus und Jesus", pp. 91 ff.

communion. Only where it is found will peace be real. "And the effect of righteousness will be peace, and the result of righteousness quietness and trust for ever." (Is. 32:17.)[13] The king of peace shall pronounce judgment for the distressed in the land with equity (Is. 11:3—4; Hos. 2:19)[14]. Peace without righteousness, a peace which would not set in order all of human society, would not be true peace, according to biblical testimony.

From this vantage point you will understand that God wants to realize His peace of righteousness through His judgment. The issue in the new world order is assent to God as the only Lord. (Is. 11:9; Hos. 2:20; Ps. 46:10.) But man denies his God this admission. That is why there is feud between God and man; that is why there is strife between man and his fellowman. If man cannot stop feuding with God nor quarrelling with his fellow—then God will put an end to it. Not until God has removed sin can He grant peace to the world. He will cleanse the lips of the nations. He will purify them by judgment. He will destroy the proud boasters, and the humble and lowly shall remain: "They shall do no wrong and utter no lies" (Zeph. 3:9—10, 11, 13).

God has promised His kingdom of peace. It is concerned, first and last, with God's righteousness. This justice, in turn, will shape communal life. Righteousness is greater than happiness. The central issue is God's righteousness and our obedience, the universal issue of the world's welfare is secondary. For in the light of God's central promise it is not fate that places our existence in doubt, but our guilt —our offence against God and men.

II. FULFILMENT

Everything that the promise of the Old Testament has told us, the New Testament brings home to us unavoidably: Jesus Christ has realized God's kingdom of peace. That is the second fact.

But is it true? Does Jesus bear God's kingdom of peace? True, at His birth the heavenly hosts proclaim peace which is to reign among men with whom God is pleased. The birth of this child is the turning point in the world's history, it is the dawn of the last age; there will not be another.

[13] The government of the King of Salvation at the end of days will see such increase "and of peace there will be no end" because His rule will be established and upheld "with justice and with righteousness" (Is. 9:7).

[14] God will betroth His Congregation to Himself "in righteousness and justice" (Hos. 2:19).

But what does this new age look like? Did Jesus make even a token attempt at abolishing war? Did He organize peace in any way at all[15]? Did He outlaw war? To be sure, He did not justify it! But he regarded "wars and rumors of wars" as apocalyptic harbingers of His return: when you hear of them "do not be alarmed; this must take place, but the end is not yet. For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom". Together with earthquakes and famines, wars shall constitute the beginning of Messianic travail (Mark. 13:7—8).

But all this means that Jesus has not fulfilled the secondary, general promise of the Old Testament—or, at least, not yet! He has not broken the "rod" of the Roman "oppressor" (Is. 9:4)! He has not liquidated the ruthless tyrant (Is. 29:20; 11:4). He has not overthrown the Military Governor Pontius Pilate, but has assured him that his power over Him comes from God (John 19:11). Jesus has not overturned all temporal thrones, has not broken all earthly swords and has not disputed the power of human judges[16]. But he has testified publicly to His kingship: "I am a king." My power in this world is not of this world. Else my soldiers should protect me from the Jews. Question: then you are a king? Answer: certainly! "For this I was born, and for this I have come into the world, to bear witness to the truth. Every one who is of the truth hears my voice" (John 18:36—37).

Surely this means: Jesus has fulfilled the central part of the divine promise during his temporal life-time, but the secondary promise, the framework, He left undecided—for His future achievement. He did not want to conquer as "the Lion of Judah" (Rev. 5:5), but to die as the "Lamb". He wanted to take away sin and bring righteousness (John 1:29). He was the only man to live entirely for God and, thus, entirely for man. He was the only one to let God truly be God, at the same time taking man seriously, as man. Doing this, He did justice to both. He obtained justice for man. That is why man can do justice to God, do justice to fellow-man. Paul calls this event reconciliation. The two great struggles have come to an end in Jesus Christ: the strife between man and God—and the war of man against man.

With this, however, that other war, too, has come to an end, the "holy war" of which the Old Testament speaks so energetically. Since the coming of Christ, God no longer wants to wage a holy war in the old sense. The holy war also was crucified on the cross of Jesus Christ: it has been judged once for all. Wherever a crusade has been proclaimed, as in the Middle Ages, wherever, as in modern times, a "war

[15] As for John the Baptist, *cf.* Luke 3:14.

[16] See Peter Brunner in: *Die Treysa-Konferenz 1950* on the subjekt "Gerechtigkeit in biblischer Sicht" (The Biblical View of Justice), pp. 49 ff.

of culture" (Kulturkrieg) or a socalled "just war" has been approved—there the Church, there "Christian" nations committed blasphemy! Already Luther knew: since the birth of Christ there has been no such thing as a "just cause" which demands a "just war". His kingdom is the only just cause. And this kingdom is a kingdom of peace which positively debars war. Those disciples who want to command fire to fall from heaven are rebuked by Jesus: "You do not know what manner of spirit you are of!" (Luke 9:54—56.)

But—one might ask—if the holy war was crucified with Jesus Christ on Good Friday, was it not perhaps — raised with Him at Easter? Indeed it was! But God has given it—as He gave Jesus Christ Himself—a completely new, a different form. God has changed it from a carnal into a spiritual war. He has provided this war with a new enemy—ourselves! Luther states it very clearly: "God's mercy triumphs in that it has made us into our own enemies"[17]! Ever since Pentecost, the holy war has blazed anew—much more fiercely than before: but on an entirely new battlefield! God has transferred it from the external front-line to the inner, to the innermost front! The main line of battle now runs straight through our heart. It is here God gains his victories. It is here we suffer our defeats. Now, indeed, there is a holy war: against our own insolence and our self-glorification. Now, indeed, there is a crusade: against our faint-heartedness and lack of faith. Now, indeed, there is the one just war: against our own injustice and implacability. Jesus tells His own severely and acidly: "Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword" (Matth. 10:34). Jesus sends His disciples as sheep in the midst of wolves[18] — not to cry with the wolves, but to testify before the world of wolves to the Gospel of peace (Matth. 10:16). As the good shepherd He has sacrificed Himself to the wolf, in order to make one flock of mankind (John 10:11—16).

The events on Golgotha resembled a thunderstorm whose bolt of lightning has claimed a victim: CHRIST! Yet the thunderstorm has cleared the air of all tension. It has created a new climate in which human beings can live, a new atmosphere in which they can breathe. An evil spell has been broken: the spell under which we men must hate, injure, torture each other. A new possibility has opened up: we may love, counsel, help one another. For righteousness has been set up, reconciliation has taken place, peace has been given.

[17] Haec est gloria gratiae Dei, quod nos fecit nobis ipsis hostes." WA. 2,586, 9. ff. — quoted from Carl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Collected Essays), Vol. I, p. 94, note 2.

[18] *Cf.* J. Schniewind's excellent interpretation of this passage in *Neues Testament Deutsch* (NTD) 2.

This peace is in the present and not simply the future. It is reality and not a dream. It is not the private peace of religious inwardness, but it is external, palpable reality. Jesus Christ has placed at one table the distant and the close-at-hand, both pietists and atheists. Even the impassable demarcation line by which God had separated Jews and pagans through thousands of years has been removed by Jesus Christ. "For he is our peace, who has made both one ... that he might ... reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end" (Eph. 2:14—16). He is peace. His body is the Church—the kingdom of peace.

Now mankind may know what it means to the world to have a God who is its Father! The Son's commandment applies to His children: "Love your enemies! bless those who curse you! do good to those who hate you and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the East and on the West and sends rain" on Moscow and Washington (Matth. 5:44—45).

All glory be to God on high, and all thanks for His mercy!

III. PROCLAMATION

The Church proclaims Jesus Christ's kingdom of peace. That is the third fact. It means:

1. God enforces it by His Word. For in this case, to proclaim does not mean: to talk about a matter, to discuss. To proclaim means, here, to announce a government. The Church proclaims this government by publishing God's reconciliation, Christ's righteousness, the remission of our sins.

A kingdom now encompasses us, a sphere of sovereignty. Christ's peace is a realm in which we may move. It is an order in which what is proclaimed actually happens—reconciliation! Christians may lead a reconciled existence. We must now all begin to learn how to practice the new life. The new climate forbids us to treat others, including our ideological and political opponents, with contempt or, worse, hatred. The new atmosphere enables us to have sympathy for all men[19]. We can realize life based on the peace of forgiveness only if we act justly and talk together in a spirit of conciliation. We Christians may

[19] Subsequently, Martin Buber's speech "Das echte Gespräch und die Möglichkeiten des Friedens" (True Conversation and the Possibilities of Peace), given at the award ceremony of the peace prize of the German book trade on September 27, 1953, has come into my hands. He also raises the question of man: "For it is not war which has brought about this crisis, but it is this, the crisis of man, which has produced this total war and the empty peace which has followed it." p. 10.

bring peace to all the children of peace (Luke 10:6). We can be free of any nervousness even in our speech. Karl Barth is right in asserting: "Hidden under the excitement and language of propaganda you can always discern mass-destruction which, then, can only be mass-murder. Under no circumstances, not even under the most extreme circumstances, may the Church find herself among the agitators and speak their language"[20]. What counts is not merely that we offer peace, but how we do it.

2. The Church's proclamation of Christ's kingdom of peace implies, further, that she must hold a mirror up to herself and to the public of all lands. Everybody recognizes his political possibilities and impossibilities in this mirror. Everybody! For Jesus Christ is Lord and head of all the world. That is why the peace of Christ is the standard also for national and international relations of states. To be sure, the peace of Christ does not include a program to be realized, point by point. But it does point out very clearly to the nations and their statesmen how peace comes about—and what peace may not be under any circumstances whatever.

Earthly peace is more than the passing respite between two wars[21]. Political peace, too, is ever the product of righteousness[22]. An ordered and just communal life of mankind is always both the basic assumption and the content of peace. Whenever social justice does not prevail within a nation, that country will be unable to maintain peaceful relations with others over any long period. A state in whose cities thousands of apartments stand empty because no working man can afford the rent, while tens of thousand of people camp out in huts and shacks, does not constitute a positive factor for peace. Neither could a positive contribution to peace be made by a state which allows its old people and the incapacitated to starve, exploits its workers and permits the "upper ten" to live in luxury, even though the word "peace" be constantly in its mouth. Peace without justice is but an empty phrase.

And peace without conciliation no less so! This applies to every politician: whoever loves peace, must hate all strife. If you

---

[20] Karl Barth, *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, "Das Gebot Gottes des Schöpfers" (The Commandment of God the Creator), III, 4, p. 527.

[21] See Buber, *op. cit.*, "Indeed, we have even become used to refer to the world's situation in which we live since the end of the Second World War, no longer as peace, but as the 'cold' phase of the world war which is declared to be permanent! . . . What history has called peace has indeed never been anything but a pause between two wars—fearful, or happy in illusions. But the Feminine Genius which the painter (of the early fresco in the Town Hall of Siena) saw in his dream is mistress not of passing respites but of new, of greater deeds" (p. 9). "The Great Peace is different in essence from non-war" (p. 8).

[22] Hermann Kutter, in *Plato und wir* (Plato and Ourselves), (1927), feels "that every war between nations must cease and will cease, as soon as governments will not merely make speeches about it to veil other intentions but truly and honestly desire *righteousness* for the orientation of political science, one might say as the sextant on the ship of state." p. 201.

love peace, you cannot also abuse your opponent! Should a peace-loving statesman do so nonetheless, then he would not only violate his human duty but also the welfare of his people. Whoever preaches hate in whatever form—be it hatred of nations or ideologies, race hatred or class hatred—is not fit to participate in the enterprise of world peace. Peace can only be effected where reconciliation, where agreement is desired.

But reconciliation cannot be extorted. It depends on mutual trust. You cannot instil confidence by coercion into anyone, least of all your opponent[23]! Excuses for war can easily be found. But peace cannot be achieved by fighting or constraint. So far, every enforced peace has borne within itself a future war. In this hour we demand of every responsible person: Are you bent upon the peace of reconciliation? Yes—or no?

But after all, who is responsible here? The politicians? The parliamentarians? Those in political organizations? Indeed, most certainly. These, too, these first of all. But the danger of total war has taught us the necessity of total peace: that is, the peace which is inseparably bound to righteousness, the peace which can flourish only in the climate of conciliation. Such total peace does not excuse anyone from responsibility.

There is a "Song of peace"[24], which evidently wants to impress this responsibility upon each individual. There is a refrain to this song: "For war is not a natural law, and peace is not a gift." Whether it is to be peace or war—"You, too, determine that. And that is every man's great decision." No one hearing this song can evade its call. But is that refrain actually true? The first line is undoubtedly correct if it means: "War is man-made." Wars do not strike like lightning out of a blue sky[25]. David Friedrich Strauss did indeed demand, a hundred years ago: "Why don't people agitate for the abolition of thunderstorms, before they agitate for the abolition of war?" But this is not a Christian's question, nor a Realist's; thus queries the cynic who conceals the real problem. When Friedrich Nietzsche, Oswald Spengler, or the early Ernst Jünger exalted war's thunder of steel as a "spiritual experience" for the "man heroic", then this was a romanticism which absolved man of all responsibility. War was simply an act of nature in

[23] "Man in Crisis, that is man who will no longer entrust his cause to conversation, because he has lost the basic assumption for that, confidence. That is why the anti-peace, possessed by war, which calls itself peace today, was able to take over mankind." Martin Buber, *op. cit.* p. 11.

[24] By Ernst Fischer (1949) in Ernst Busch, *op. cit.* pp. 126 ff.

[25] For the following, *cf.* Walter Künneth, *Politik zwischen Dämon und Gott: eine christliche Ethik des Politischen* (Politics betwixt Evil and God: a Christian political ethic), Berlin 1954, pp. 317—318.

the realm of historical life which is the abode of that beast of prey, man. In the last war, this romanticism cost us Germans alone close to five million human beings! Not a single word need be wasted on it. For it is indeed true: men bear responsibility for war. Even if God uses them to carry out His judgments, this is no justification for man: "War is not a natural law."

But even though the first line may be ever so true, does this make the second one valid, "Peace is not a gift"? Peace — in paradoxial contrast to war — is nothing but a gift. You may experience this even in personal relations between men: wherever tensions are relaxed, where quarrels are settled, where good human relationships are re-established, every unspoilt human being will feel the newly created communion to be something not begotten by himself. Political peace, peace among nations, has likewise always been regarded by unaffected men as an undeserved gift. Men can, indeed, break communal ties. But communion cannot be healed, much less be created except by—one Other! This does not mean, to be sure, that we do not bear personal responsibility for peace. On the contrary; we are just as responsible for peace as for war—perhaps, indeed, more seriously so. Only, we are responsible for peace in a different way. For it, we bear responsibility as for a precious gift entrusted into our hands for safe-keeping. In contrast, we are responsible for war as for any of our deeds and crimes. For war is human creation, and therefore human offence.

3. Finally, there is the decisive question: what can we Christians concretely do for peace? After all, we are the people of whom Jesus says in the Sermon on the Mount: "Blessed are the peacemakers!" Can we do anything worth mentioning? Yes, we can. What is more, we must! God demands it. Let me briefly say just three things:

a) Firstly: God demands that you in your own person keep Christ's kingdom of peace in force by praying for peace. That may seem a trifling matter. But it is the greatest thing you can possibly do. For know this: your prayer is a decisive political factor. Subjectively, this is true: for as long as you pray, as you keep praying against yourself, you will stand in the peace of God, you will live by righteousness, your existence will bring forth reconciliation, you will be a forgiving person. And only forgiving persons can keep political peace secure. But objectively, too, this is true: Your prayer is a real power. Luther knew: "The Word of God and the prayer of Christians maintain the world." In the *Large Catechism*, in the preface to the Lord's Prayer, Luther asked the highly realistic question: "What do you think? Why have such great things been manifested in

public? Why have the plans of the enemies come to naught? Why has not war come? Answer: there are a few devout men who have prayed with constancy. And their prayer has preserved us like a wall of iron. Had those few men not prayed, then the world should indeed have witnessed a tragedy horrible beyond compare. For then the devil would have drowned all Germany in its own blood"[26]. Thus far Martin Luther! Whatever occurs in the political world today, what evil is being prevented — as perhaps in the Geneva conference decision on the Indochina war — it does not come about without the prayer of the peacemakers.

b) Secondly: you can keep Christ's kingdom of peace in force by always being involved yourself in whatever you think, say, and do. It is not enough to think something, to say something, to do something connected with peace. Some people think themselves particularly active for peace if they repeat the word "peace" as often as possible, either orally or through their fountainpen. If nothing more stands behind it, then all this is mere pseudoactivity, indeed, it is essentially an escape from concrete responsibility for peace. The pagans used to put off their gods by some sacrifice so that they might be left alone. We moderns are wont to get rid of an annoying beggar by giving him a dime. In all this we sacrifice something in order to keep ourselves from being involved. If you want to labor for peace you should not, for a start, talk or write about peace, but you should keep the peace! You should be intent, body and soul, to clear the atmosphere of hate and to make the climate of reconciliation perceptible. This cannot be done by grandiloquent programs and solemn resolutions which cost you nothing, but only in the midst of every-day tensions. Whether we are "activists" of peace can be determined in the daily grind of our occupation: do we maintain a relationship of disinterested, pure humanity to our fellow-workers? It can be determined at the point where nothing but a wall separates us from our neighbor's room: are we truly able to bear—indeed, to carry—him? It can be determined wherever several family groups must prepare their soup in one kitchen, on one gas ring, under the most cramped conditions. Whoever fails to be a peacemaker in such tasks is unfit to achieve anything essential towards the peace of nations.

c) Third and last: you can keep Christ's kingdom of peace in force by raising up signs of the presence of the — coming kingdom. Let us think quite soberly, quite materialistically! World will be world. Jesus

[26] This translation is based on the Latin text found in *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Ev.-Luth. Kirche* (The Symbolic Books of the Ev. Luth. Church) (1930), II, 669, 28 ff., with reference to Henry Eyster Jacobs (ed.), *The Book of Concord*, Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1911, p. 453.

Christ had no intention of being a world improver. He was far more radical. He wanted to — abolish the world in its present state and to transform it into an utterly new world (Mark 2:21—22). He Himself has raised up signs for this: He has healed the sick, freed the possessed, raised the dead. By these things did He announce that the reorganization was to include the external conditions of life.

We, too, can signal the dawn of the world-to-come, each with his gifts. We cannot change the world. But we may erect sign-posts to indicate the final goal: signs of philanthropy, of kindness, of readiness to help. In the midst of senseless history, rumbling towards the abyss, drag-chains can be attached to the tumbril, brake-blocks for the funeral cart. Anyone can be such a retarding factor, such a brake, anyone who counsels understanding, calls for reflection—or just for a return to reason. How many tensions could be released! How much self-inflicted duress cries out for liberation! God can use us, against our expectation, employ us, as it were, over our own heads, to manoeuvre others out of the obstinate mire of their chosen principles—to free them unto human candor. God can turn men who have been petrified into phonograph records back again into human beings. The peacemakers are people "who, disinterestedly, place themselves into the line of fire of two warring factions, in order to try and establish peace"[27]. Standing between both camps and above their ideologies, the peacemakers can talk to any reasonable person who is serious about peace. Jesus Christ takes sincere friends of peace seriously: "For he that is not against us is for us" (Mark 9:40). There is a unity among all human men which reaches beyond any denomination or ideology. If others want to speak to us, we shall not refuse them[28]. Should they want true peace — the peace of righteousness, without hatred, the peace of reconciliation and harmony — then they can count on us. They might even learn something from us: to avoid the countless errors of which Christendom has been guilty, even in the cause of peace, on its long road through the centuries.

I must come to an end and will recapitulate. Let us proclaim to the world which longs for peace: Jesus Christ is our peace. He is the kingdom of God. He has fulfilled the core of God's promise, has gone straight to the heart, to us men. But He has left open God's promised frame-work: the universal fulfilment of the world-wide promise is

[27] W. Foerster, (1935), in Kittel, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, II, 418, 19 ff.

[28] "Despite everything I believe that the nations in this hour can come into true conversation with one another. A true conversation is one in which each partner fruitfully perceives the other, assents to and confirms his separate existence, even where there is a difference between them; only thus can the difference, not indeed be made to disappear, but be humanly resolved, be brought close to the point where it may be surmounted." Martin Buber, *op. cit.*, pp. 13 f.

yet to come. We receive God's great hope in the midst of a world which reels back and forth between despair and false hopes. We live in between the Advents of Jesus Christ, in twilight, in tension which sometimes is all but unbearable. We have and yet do not have. For Jesus Christ has indeed brought us God's righteousness, but not yet the happiness of the perfected world. Today He tells us: "Seek first the kingdom of God and has righteousness, and all the happiness of God's world shall be yours as well" (Matth. 6:33).

The question whether man creates circumstances or whether, reversely, circumstances condition man, has been unmasked as not presenting any true issue at all. God's new world will bring forth the new man and the new world order at the same time. "But we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (II Peter 3:13). And because we are waiting, we are going — to work!

In that we rejoice — rejoice in hope (Rom. 12:12).

Since I know you to be an advocate of community life, will you observe how clearly the Holy Scriptures show that the state will be happy through no means other than those which will make individual man happy.

AUGUSTINE (from a letter)

RAGNAR BRING

Faith in the Future and Hope of Eternal Life

In the following, we are going to consider faith in the future to mean, first of all, reliance upon a future for us here on earth, reliance upon a happy and worthy future for which we can work and fight. You may think of the future of the individual, of his happiness and task in life, of his work. But the future of the individual and that of the nation are bound up together. In peacetime, perhaps, we think mostly of the future of each individual, of each private person. The life of a people, or of states, is left to depend upon itself; at least, we think less about it. But the upheaval of the historic events of our time has taught us how intimately the destiny and future of the individual is connected with that of his country. We had to learn to think more highly of the country's welfare than of the individual's life, to exert ourselves to the utmost for the sake of its future, if we believed in it.

In times when Christian ideals and principles were unfamiliar, or unknown, or dismissed, individuals have occasionally substituted faith in the future, a belief in life here on earth, for the Christian belief in eternity. And one can easily advance this as one of two alternatives: as the normal and acceptable attitude of modern human beings, belief in a better future here on earth, opposed to belief in heaven, in eternity. However, reliance on the future has led us into a crisis.

It is now evident that, in many countries, faith in the future finds itself in a difficult dilemma. In some places in Europe it seems to have disappeared. The future looks so black and hopeless that people can see no change for the better, and this is a greater affliction than hunger and cold. In other places, belief in the future survives, a brave, hardy faith in defiance of all difficulties, a belief that, finally, when you fight your way day by day and hope, or try to hope, you may dare look ahead. On the whole, it seems as if the West is now depressed by pessimism and great fears for the future. People wonder what the world may look like in fifty years. This pessimism which has seized many and which, to some extent, affects the

attitudes of all of us, seems especially conspicuous compared to the safe, sometimes presumptuous, cultural optimism that prevailed in these same countries half a century ago. Everything, then, was regarded optimistically; development would lead almost automatically, it was thought, to more liberty for the individual and to more power over nature for mankind. This power, naturally, was regarded as productive of happiness. Though the compulsions and problems that increased industrialization must cause had begun to be felt — as well as the feeling of mutual dependence resulting from the development of technical culture — people, especially in the large cities, still believed in a liberty and a happiness that were to develop almost on their own. They also believed in more reasonable circumstances — evil was relegated to the superstition and ignorance of times past; good was consigned to the future when "reason" would reign. Even wars would cease and general peace prevail.

A land of material happiness on earth apparently lay around the corner. And it seemed as if the realization of this land was delayed only by some still-existing prejudices and superstitions, by an out-of-date religion and moral code, in which Christianity with its belief in heaven and another life after this one here on earth was often included. No doubt, this cultural optimism of the turn of the century and its happy belief in the future had a great deal of inherent vitality. But they did not lead to general peace and happiness and thus are, today, discredited. The wars came instead, and now we are far less optimistic than we were in those former days, notwithstanding the fact that the power of man over nature, scientific knowledge, and technical potentialities have increased to an almost fantastic degree. Examining more closely the cultural optimism at the turn of the century, we would probably find among its constituents both a sound feeling of vitality and a happy will to improve circumstances here on earth. There had been a lively growth of interest in social problems, and many reforms had been carried out. The prevailing feeling that "times were progressing" was not quite unfounded, for old inconveniences had been abolished and improvements realized. But this optimism was raised to be much more than rational, sober belief in the future — it became a kind of religion, an almost blind belief in development towards better circumstances on earth, despite signs to the contrary. This faith did not want to be Christian but turned against Christianity and, especially, against the latter's idea of eternity, against life after death, against Heaven.

However, there were certainly many Christians who understood faith in eternity as very different from faith in the future; and there

arose a sharp conflict between their conception of Christianity and cultural optimism. Consolation was to be sought in heaven. The enemies of Christianity mockingly said that those whom one did not care to assist in obtaining their rights on earth were to be consoled with the happiness of heaven. As a matter of fact, in certain Christian circles an atmosphere did prevail in which heaven and the future life were regarded as the sole good. One positively longed to have done with earthly life. There were, no doubt, in those quietistic circles, both honest and righteous people who were gripped by the Christian message of eternal life, and others who combined a sentimental faith with an indifference in social matters that was quite unchristian.

It is strange how easily a false set of alternatives appeared at this point. Christian interest turned away from the world, and leaders in cultural development became secularized, turning faith in the future into a substitute religion. At the time, the Lutheran view of Christianity seemed least able to serve as a guide — Lutheranism was often misinterpreted as not interested in social work and progress. Christian voices of cultural importance usually tended towards Reformed Calvinistic tradition.

The alternative between either yearning away from earth towards life after death, or secularized belief in the future is, however, a false alternative. For faith in the future and hope of eternity are tied together — the one is of sound and right character only when taken together with the other. Faith in the future turns towards this earth, towards this life. But God reigns as creating, life-giving power also here on earth. Faith in God and eternity does not preclude a sound faith in the future but, on the contrary, gives it balance and firmness, strength and tenacity. On the other hand, hope that turns toward another world, toward a future life, will be sound only if it is combined with valid faith in the future.

We are thus faced with a double question: what then is faith in the future and what does hope of eternity really mean? In what way may these two be connected? And under what circumstances do they tend to exclude one another, each competing with, instead of complementing, the other?

Let us, first, turn to faith in the future. The most obvious psychological basis for faith in the future is, perhaps, the natural feeling of life itself, the immediate feeling of creative power, and the ability to realize aims and purposes which one can regard as necessary and right. This feeling of life and creative force, may however, sometimes bring forth a somewhat arrogant, presumptuous, and self-assured faith in the future. In order to make room for the new that is

to be created, whatever stands in the way, everything old and established by usage, must needs be removed. Because of this, a struggle between the generations frequently develops. The future "belongs to us", youth feels. Young people sense instinctively that they have creative powers. The previous generation, especially in its view of life, usually is regarded as behind the times — it is said that nothing seems so old-fashioned and out-of-date to a young generation as the parents' point of view. Even that of the grandparents is more easily endured, for one is not in immediate opposition to it. This may account for the fact that young faith, emanating from the natural feeling of life, will sometimes attach itself to ideals that lie far back in time and are viewed romantically. Thus romanticism could look back to the Viking Age as holding the view of life that ought to be that of the future. And in the immense wave of bold natural growth and repressionless faith in the future caused by the Renaissance, men sought the ideal in the classical age, in the cultural life of antiquity, which they then idealized and unconsciously transformed. The spirit of antiquity was regarded as that of the future; indeed, faith in the future rested on the hope of reviving the spirit and culture of this antiquity. Thus it was thought that all barbarism would disappear— the kind of barbarism which dominated the science of scholasticism. The darkness that reigned was to give way to bright day when the light of antiquity should shine again. The sophistry of scholasticism was to be thrown on a rubbish-heap, and the true knowledge that comes with knowledge of the ancient languages and the cultural value which they conveyed, would flourish. Faith in the future and contempt for the old, for scholasticism, were so strong that this Renaissance view has dominated the popular way of looking at things right down to our days. People still talk of the night of the Middle Ages, of the darkness of scholasticism, of its meaningless sophistry and its barbarism, although we know this to be a false and unjust picture.

If we will study the Renaissance with its violent, strident faith in the future, if we seek to make an accounting of and to test its contents, we encounter, first of all, the general difficulty of the question of values which depends upon the subjective determination of worth. So much may be affirmed, however, that one culture was torn down and another built up — new truths were brought forward, but old values were cast away. Scholasticism was dealt with unjustly and, without doubt, with a lack of understanding. The undeniably high culture created by the Middle Ages and their scholasticism was simply underrated, misjudged, and misunderstood. One complained about the linguistic barbarism of scholasticism, but the Humanists' edu-

cated and aristocratic demand for a strictly classical Latin made it too difficult to be maintained as a spoken cultural language. It ceased to be the fluent, flexible expression of a living culture. The classical touch took something away from the living force of the language and made it into an artificial product. National languages and national cultures developed, thereby demolishing the cultural foundations for the only universal unity Western Europe has ever had, and giving rise to the national orgies of later periods and to the ruthless cult of the state. A humanistic culture was developed; but unfortunately it lacked understanding for much that was finest in the old. If we look at the great prophet of humanism, Erasmus of Rotterdam, we may admire him in many ways. But at the same time we must contend, when observing his contemptuous criticism of scholastic philosophy and theology, that the great king of humanism quite simply did not understand the subtle finesse of the philosophy and theology which he derided. In brief, though much was built up, much was torn down. A new art was created, great in architecture and painting, an art which still speaks to us with many voices. It may, however, be symbolic that, when the mighty new Saint Peter's Basilica was erected in Rome, the oldest and most notable building in Christendom — the old Constantinian Basilica — was demolished.

Yet Renaissance and Humanism carried along such strong faith in the future and so much natural creative force that they could be rejuvenated several times. In new forms they inspired the Enlightenment's idea that all that was old could be discarded and that a new "enlightened" age would dawn when the spirit of reason, common sense, and refined taste came to reign, when *raison* and *esprit* would rule and old prejudices be vanquished. It was, probably, something of this that reappeared in a new shape as cultural optimism at the end of the last century, even though, at that time, many other cultural influences were (less important) contributing factors.

Thus the Renaissance had a faith in the future founded on the natural feeling of life, a faith that seemed strong enough to create new values. But, at the same time, it gave rise to destructive forces. And, from a Christian point of view, its destructive character is revealed by the fact that, at the very time it was creating values based on strong natural life, it developed into a religion, into a basically anti-Christian religion. This was the tendency — sometimes weakened by humanism and, later, by rationalism; but the Renaissance in its original Italian form (e. g. Marsilio Ficino) believed in Man, a belief that competed with the Christian hope of eternity which is founded on faith in God, Lord of mankind, Creator and Redeemer. One might

say that this faith showed its secularized character in that it did not stop at being a limited trust in life on earth with its finite and transient wisdom, good in itself but earthly and transitory, but wanted to perpetrate these cultural values forever; faith in the future turned itself into an eternal faith. Earth was turned into heaven, and man into God. Faith in a human god is a faith directly adverse to hope of eternity; what is worshipped is either the individual, or the state that man creates, or the technology by which man makes the world subservient.

Thus arose a conflict between faith in the future (though the future does belong to life in this natural world) and Christian faith in the Eternal God who is Lord and Lifegiver. When faith in the future becomes faith in man, self-glorifying sovereign man, then it turns away from its innermost and deepest source, then it is cut off from its deepest flow of vitality, and then it also loses its proper limitation. Perhaps it does not loose its strength — just as ground-shoots can grow high when not restrained. But it adds a demolishing and brutal characteristic to the natural and life-asserting character that derives from the Lord of Creation. Assertion of life in its inconsiderate, ruthless form passes into a kind of life-denial or, rather, in practice it becomes a demolishing force, a destructive power. Ruthless worship of life denies the profoundest law of all life: love for one's brother, understanding of other people, charity, community. Self-assertion then becomes the highest law. But in the last resort, this leads to the destruction of life and culture. Then a meaningless worship of power and brutality will flourish. Alienation from the Creator, from the source of all life, brings revengeful consequences — life grows, apparently, without restraint, but the growth becomes a growth into death.

In this way the feeling of life, of creative power and force in man, eventually leads to brutality and contempt for human dignity; and in misfortune it easily turns into pessimism and lack of stability, into despair and suicide. The worship of man as God, of man instead of God, leads to contempt for man; that is the paradoxical logic of life and life's own witness to God, the Creator and Lifegiver. The first Commandment is written over all of life—and breaking it brings revenge in terrible and inflexible consequences. Faith in the future without faith in God becomes, in the end, despair, hopelessness, a meaningless wasting of vital powers — and this precisely through its unchecked and undisciplined evolution and its results.

When the natural feeling of life's power in man, and faith in the future founded on this feeling, are restrained by external misfortunes, pessimism may easily follow. But there is the possibility that

faith in man, checked by external conditions, may look for a substitute in an imagined, supposedly Christian, hope of eternity. In difficult periods people sometimes throw overboard all faith in the future and seek satisfaction in the hope of another world which may, then, easily become a false faith in eternity. Perhaps a Feuerbach could correctly characterize it as an expression of human desires; psychoanalysis might characterize it as a return to repressed hopes and impulses or ascribe it to complexes which arise when earthly desires are thwarted. But this is not genuine Christian hope of eternity. There are many false religions. When Feuerbach viewed religion as an expression of man's fear and hope, of wishes and dreads, he did not see more than Luther had discerned earlier and more clearly when he delineated the picture of a false religion, a self-made faith which does not reach the true God but remains, intrinsically, a worship of self: the religion of "the Old Man". Psychoanalysis has often aimed its critique at such false Christianity and has rightly seen it as a sublimation of the natural wishes and desires of self-asserting natural vitality. The curious thing about the Christian hope of eternity is, however, that it does not have its origin in the individual's instinct for selfpreservation, and that it is not a form of one's own wish and desire for life and fear of death. In other words, it is not a product of faith in the future — of the wish for life and success.

What then is Christian hope of eternity, this hope that is neither a substitute for a lost faith in the future, nor an expression of a secret sub-conscious natural desire to live? It is not a belief in something within ourselves, even the most secret or noble in us. It is not faith in man at all, but simply a belief in God, a faith in the God who has created earthly life. Yet it is also something much more than this: faith in the Lord who would still be God "even though all lands were desert" and all life on earth were to cease.

Real faith in God contains hope for eternity. For God is Eternal— He is Eternity. He is not far from life on earth. He has Himself created it all, and He lives in it, and we have our life from Him. But He has, furthermore, come to earth in a new and special way, in Christ, and has in this way given us a relationship to the kingdom that is not of this world but is an eternal kingdom. And it is this faith in God, the faith in the future kingdom, that is typical of Christian hope of eternity.

Because of this, faith in God and eternity never has its origin within us — its origin lies beyond ourselves. And therefore we ought to look forward to something outside of us, something ahead of us, to a future that is grounded neither in our life nor in a continuation of

it, a future that does not belong to earth but to eternity, to Heaven. Also, that is why this other kingdom, the kingdom of salvation created by God, is hidden from us, why we cannot know it by ourselves, still less prepare or create it.

However, the fact that Christ came here, down to earth, means that we have come into contact with this kingdom here on earth. Or, in other words: the kingdom has come to us. But when we meet it in the words and works of Christ, all of which we see as an expression of God's own actions, we still stand under the conditions of this our existence and belong to it. Because of this, we cannot see clearly but only believe, trust, and hope. Through Christ we have connection with the new that we cannot reach by ourselves, but only thus. If we are to reach it, that kingdom must gain or win us. We can only pray, "Thy kingdom come". We can only accept it. But when we receive it and have experienced something of it, then we will find in it the completion of much that here appears only as demands that never can be realized. We shall then see that righteousness and love which we have heard spoken of here on earth, but which we have never been able to realize within ourselves. When we are confronted with the Word about that kingdom and its righteousness we feel: this is right, this is from God, for this we have been created though we have never been able to develop it within ourselves and by our own strength. Before the new which meets us there, we feel overpowered and subdued and acknowledge it as something from God Himself, just as Saint Peter confessed before Christ, "Thou art the Messiah, the Son of the Living God". But then it is the same with us as with Saint Peter — our knowledge does not derive from "flesh and blood", but "from the Father Himself in heaven".

To be overpowered and subdued by this belief in eternity and the hope of the new kingdom, of God's kingdom, the kingdom of heaven, is, in a sense, to turn away from oneself. But this turning away is of quite a different order than the attitude of pessimism or despair which in imagination carries you away from this life or which wants to deny life's value. Faith in eternal life in the Christian sense means, on the contrary, contact with the God who is also Master of this world, who has created and given us body and soul and placed us here into this temporal life and who has sent Jesus Christ to earth. And here on earth He permits us to be subdued by such faith in eternity. This faith, this hope of eternity, most definitely does not imply a denial of life. Hope of eternity involves, rather, the very deepest wish to live. This is also connected with a right faith in the future. The same God who created this world, this earth, this life,

and who still lives as a creating, life-giving power in it — He is the same God who gives us the new kingdom of salvation. It is this same God who gives us faith in the future, which faith, in obedience to Him, will be sound, strong, and capable of resisting attack, and it will also give us the new life of salvation, eternal life. If we are subdued in the proper way by the hope of eternity, our faith in the future will also be right. It will not become a belief in something eternal in us alone, not a belief in man, not a substitute for religion, but a natural, sound belief in the future, a joy and happiness for the creative force that we feel within us and that ultimately comes from God and ought to be received as His gift. Faith in the future will be a sober faith when it is thus founded on faith in God. Life can be seen in its finiteness and limitations, not in an imaginary eternal world. God lets us be mortal now — but able to build up a life of association and communion, serving one another here on earth. He has also given us something more — faith in Himself, contact with the origin and the creator of life. In Christ, in the completion of the whole life, God has given us direct participation in His new, eternal kingdom, so that life shall be what it was created to be: an eternal life in obedience to God.

Thus we may be brought up and disciplined here on earth to receive the kingdom of eternity. But this does not develop from this life. In the earthly life, in marriage and in community life, in society and in the state, in all towards which our faith in the future is directed, we can be prepared to receive and recognize God's kingdom, so that we may acknowledge it when it is given to us. To faith in the future belongs, above all, the work for righteousness: righteousness in private life, in all one's dealing, righteousness in social conditions: in those of the state, in those between states. If we do not work for righteousness there, then we do not understand what God's kingdom is, and we can neither recognize it nor profess it. We are commanded to show forth righteousness here on earth: willingness, mercy, charity, and to serve our brother. One who is not brought up by law and does not obey the law will never be able to see and understand the gospel. But no law-abiding can make us worthy of the eternal kingdom, no earthly zeal can give us the right to lay claim to it. That must be given to us from above. We can hope and believe and trust in it, but we cannot demand it or claim it.

Faith in the future here on earth and hope of eternity must not be mixed up. Faith in the future belongs to earth and should concentrate on earthly things. But it must not be forgotten that temporal, finite values really are values, though they refer to things that are

perishable. You can, and ought to, be able to give your life for wife and children, for your native country. You can devote yourself to the culture of the land, to the education and prosperity of the nation, and to its future — in spite of the fact that here there is no question of eternal values. We are all going to die, and the earth will once more lie in ruins. Yet we have in this temporal life values to live and die for, values to which we must be faithful. Our judicial system, our freedom, our lawful social order — all belong to this word but possess values for which we can sacrifice ourselves. From the Christian point of view, all these are gifts and tasks from God. God gives us all this, He directs us, He bids us live our lives here: to complete our tasks, to serve our neighbors, to struggle for what is right: righteousness, mercy, goodwill, and love. Here we shall develop new things, improve the economy. We have to work for the future, for our God Himself bids us do so. His law shows the way forward, and He Himself creates forms for fellowship and renewal. He leads us through outer circumstances, through our calling, to serve one another. He teaches us to do this, even when our hearts are hard and selfish.

When this faith in the future is founded on faith in the Creator, then it will needs be creative. Man and earth do not then become eternal, but the Creator's bidding given to mortal man is obeyed at the same time as faith in God makes man prepared to receive His Gospel about the new kingdom of heaven, about eternity, the Gospel about Christ and His full righteousness and love. Faith in God means faith in God as both, Creator and Saviour — it refers both to earth and heaven. It leads to both, faith in the future and hope of eternity.

What matters today, for us, is proper faith in the future. Towards such a faith we must help each other, as individuals and as nations. To lack such proper faith is to be bereft of a life-value that is given to us by the Lord and Giver of Life. We must help others to a right faith in the future when grave outer circumstances cause them to doubt that faith.

If a certain class of society is oppressed and thereby loses faith in the future, it is for us to do all in our power that it may find true faith. Here, however, hope of eternity must not be preached, for hope of eternity is no substitute for faith in the future. Instead, then is the time to work for social justice, to speak for the oppressed, to give them courage. Heaven will not be a substitute for earth. On the contrary, heaven is not understood if justice is not sought on this earth. Social justice cannot create a heaven on earth, cannot give eternal values, cannot be a substitute for the hope of eternity. But justice can make life endurable and help to give security for the future.

Faith in the future and hope of eternal life can never be substituted for each other. They are both given to us by the God who is the Master and Creator, who is "Completer" and Redeemer of life. We live here on earth under the law of God. But law will make room for Gospel, and the Gospel will be a fulfilment of the righteousness of the law. Faith in God gives to life on earth a meaning, even in showing its limitations — it makes the values of life absolute in the midst of their finiteness and impermanence, holy in the midst of their secular character. But, at the same time, it points to a new creation where all which is here defective is, there, complete, where the righteousness for which we are created but which no law can procure nor attain here on earth, is given to us.

Misery induces despair, pride induces presumption. The Incarnation shows man the greatness of his misery through the greatness of the remedy it needed.

BLAISE PASCAL, PENSÉES (544 H. F. Stewart ed.)

AIMO T. NIKOLAINEN

Baptism, Conversion and Regeneration

To a European New Testament scholar the reluctance with which American theology took up the question of eschatology during the preparations for the World Council of Churches Assembly at Evanston was quite a surprise; evidently it found this question rather novel. But eschatological concern in exegetical studies dates back 50 years. Admittedly, the explanations and applications of New Testament eschatology are diverse. We can distinguish three or four different stages in the history of eschatological exegesis. Nevertheless, the eschatological contents of the New Testament *kerygma* has been apparent for a long time. On the other hand, it might be worth inquiring whether the practical proclamation and instruction of our Lutheran Churches has profited by the achievements of exegetical study. That the eschatological aspect has been neglected in Lutheran sermons and discussions seems fairly certain. Possibly this is one reason for the doctrinal disagreements in today's Lutheran Christendom.

I shall try to prove this thesis by scrutinizing one single aspect, that of Regeneration. There is great divergence of opinion about this doctrinal question within the Lutheran Churches. But it is not merely either a theoretical or a historical problem, it is a focal point in the Church's living work of preaching. The way of salvation leads through rebirth; and the question is where, at what stage, rebirth is to be found. One party claims that rebirth occurs in baptism, the other that it takes place through conversion and the awakening of faith. This contradiction is characteristic of the present situation in Lutheranism. But these are not merely two emphases, one more objective and the other more subjective, which determine the direction of one's Christianity. Such cause of tension exists within every confessional form of Christianity. Rather, these different interpretations of rebirth arise from the special position of Lutheranism among the Christian Churches. Catholic sacramentalism from the one side and Reformed theology and methods of "proselytism" from the other exert continual influence on Lutheran thinking and preaching. We now have two mixed forms of Lutheranism; the one is represented not only by the "high-church movements" with their affection for

sacramental and liturgical traditions, but also by some rigidly orthodox and conservative groups who also base all their theology on baptism as the sacrament of rebirth; the other appears in those numerous evangelistic revival movements and tendencies which take scarcely any notice of baptism but stress personal awakening and conversion. Their whole conception of the Church is individualistic. The *ecclesia* is *congregatio sanctorum et regenitorum*, a communion of persuaded Christians who have been born anew.

A quick glance at the New Testament shows that, to a certain extent, both parties are right. The great significance of baptism for salvation is illustrated twice by the characteristic picture of rebirth. "He saved us ... by the washing of regeneration and renewal in the Holy Spirit" (Titus 3:5). "Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God" (John 3:5). The washing and the water are both apparent equivalents for baptism. The train of thought is clear. No one can simply enter the communion of the kingdom of God, unchanged. The change in man is so great that a new, a second birth is required. By baptism this change is realized. It is the gateway, the entrance into the new, the eternal life of the kingdom of God. The Holy Spirit plays a crucial role in this. Christian baptism is thoroughly different from the baptism of John precisely because it is the sole mediator of the gift of the Spirit. Only by the power of the Holy Spirit is rebirth possible in baptism.

But, on the other hand, regeneration is also set forth in the passage: "You have been born anew ... through the living and abiding word of God" (I Peter 1:23). This rebirth by the word is described more closely in John 5:24: "He who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life; he does not come into judgment but has passed from death to life". The fourth Evangelist does not, of course, use the image of rebirth; but a passing from death to life is identical with second birth. The Gospel has been preached. The voice of Jesus as the Son of God has been heard in the proclamation of the Word, and thus faith has been created. This "process" constitutes a real change in man; he has moved into a different "sphere". He who believes is reborn. In this case of regeneration as well, the Holy Spirit is of crucial significance. "The wind blows where it wills, and you hear the sound of it ... so it is with every one who is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8). The Spirit is the main factor in both baptism and faith.

The parallelism between regeneration in baptism and rebirth through the Word and in faith is not complete, however. True, baptism and faith are two expressions of the same purpose, they belong

together, as we shall show in more detail, but they must also be carefully distinguished one from the other. An observation which I have found nowhere else is that the New Testament Greek consistently uses different tenses for these two cases of regeneration. If they concern baptism, the predicate verbs are in the aorist tense which expresses a momentary event in the past which occurred once for all. Baptism resembles a solitary apex; it cannot be repeated. If, however, they concern the awakening of faith, the verbs describing the change in the believer appear in the perfect tense. Faith, too, has its starting point in the past, but it must constantly renew itself. It represents a continuous line. In Titus 3:5 we had the aorist: "he saved" = *ésôsen*. The same form is found in John 3:3,5. Both predicates, "is born anew" and "is born of water" stand in the aorist: *gennêthê anôthen, gennêthê ex hydatos*. The aorist is the tense of baptism throughout the New Testament. "All of us who have been baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised *(ebaptisthêmen)* into his death. We were buried *(synetáfêmen)* therefore with him by baptism into death" (Romans 6:3—4). "For by one Spirit we were all baptised *(ebaptisthêmen)* into one body" (I Cor. 12:13). "For as many of you as were baptised *(ebaptisthête)* into Christ have put on Christ *(enedysasthe)* (Gal. 3:27). "You were buried *(syntafentes)* with him in baptism, in which you were also raised *(synêgérthête)* with him" (Col. 2:12). "(They) were saved *(diesôthêsan)* through water" (I Peter 3:20). The aorist implication of baptism is also evident in the Gospel's great commission: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptising them" *(poreuthentes mathêteusate baptizontes*, or, in codices B and D, *baptisantes)*, (Matth. 28:19). "Go into all the world and preach... He who believes and is baptized will be saved" *(...kêryxate... ho pisteusas kai baptistheis sôthêsetai)* (Mark 16:15—16). On the basis of all this, it is evident that the eulogy of I Peter 1:3 also concerns rebirth and baptism: "By his great mercy we have been born anew to a living hope" *(anagennêsas*, an aorist in active). The unique significance of baptism is expressed by the highly effective image of a new — but of precisely only one new — birth.

The second form of regeneration, the one which must ever be renewed, is as consistently described by the New Testament as the first one. It is not by chance that the reality of the Christian's new life presented by I Peter 1:23 is depicted by a verb in the perfect tense: "you have been born anew" = *anagegennêmenoi*. The same tense appears also in the other central passage about rebirth through the Word, John 5:24: "he has passed from death to life" is rendered by

the perfect: *metabebêken.* The two forms of regeneration are also evident in Jesus' discussion with Nicodemus (John 3) which presents the whole way of salvation. The unique rebirth and baptism is only a starting point. He who will be saved must be born of the Spirit (3:6). This new state and quality must be renewed time after time. The verb "is born" *(gegennêmenos)* is now in the perfect tense. What has once been brought to light must continue. It is of the nature of faith to be new each day. The fourth gospel also indicates by what means this rebirth in faith takes place. The main factors are the Spirit who blows where He will and the testimony, the Gospel, which is to be received (3:8—11).

But the most convincing passages arguing rebirth by faith are 1 John 5:1 and 4. "Every one who believes that Jesus is the Christ is a child of God" (a more literal translation would be: "is born of God"— *ek tou theou gegennêtai).* "For whatever is born of God overcomes the world; and this is the victory that overcomes the world, our faith". Faith is the state in which recurring rebirth, to be born of God, *(gegennêtai*—perfect), is possible.

Thus the controversy about regeneration has been proved unnecessary. The New Testament separates regeneration in baptism and that in faith by a thorough grammatical differentiation. Yet it does not teach two different ways of salvation. Both forms of regeneration belong to the same way. Now, this very New Testament way is an eschatological order of salvation. The study of the New Testament as a whole shows clearly that regeneration is primarily a future, an eschatological event and that baptism and faith constitute a preliminary rebirth, a foretaste of final salvation. It is significant that on the one occasion — according to the synoptic tradition — when Jesus Himself speaks about regeneration, Matthew 19:28, it is in a purely eschatological context: "In the new world", (a literal translation would be "in the regeneration"—*en tê paliggenesiâ),* "when the Son of man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones. . ." This saying has usually been neglected in the study of rebirth, because it speaks about the regeneration of the whole world and not of individual man. This is a fatal error. The genuine New Testament idea of regeneration presupposes a change of aeons. This age, the old time, must give way to the new age (Mark 10:30). This will happen when the Son of man comes, and it concerns the total world. "The form of this world is passing away" (I Cor. 7:31). But at the same time it implies change also in the fate of individuals. In His answer to the Sadducees, Jesus points to the resurrection as the crucial event which changes all things. "The sons

of this age marry and are given in marriage; but those who are accounted worthy to attain to that age and to the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage" (Luke 20:34—35). The order of life is completely transformed. After the resurrection men shall be as the angels. This actual regeneration will not occur until the resurrection.

Paul, too, sees in the resurrection of individual Christians the true regeneration. He does not use quite this term, but he means the same thing when he writes: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 15:50). The man of this age cannot straight away enter into the eschatological kingdom of the world to come. There must first be a complete change. "I tell you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed" (I Cor. 15:51). It is worth noting that Paul is talking about a complete transformation of his fellow-Christians. Whatever they may have experienced in their Christian life, however far they may have advanced in their spiritual pilgrimage, they have to be totally changed. Even the fullest sanctification falls short of the requirements of regeneration. Final salvation, true regeneration, the ultimate justification of the sinner, these will take place in the resurrection at the coming, at the Parousia, of Christ.

This interpretation may be verified and confirmed in John's theology. According to him, Christians "are God's children now" (I John 3:2). But it is not yet apparent what they will be. "We know that when he appears we shall be like him." The children of God will become sons of God when the only Son of God appears. But this is eschatological regeneration.

According to the New Testament, this transformation at the resurrection is the main event in regeneration; it determines the other two. Regeneration by baptism and by faith are precursors of future regeneration. This is the meaning of Paul's assertion "in this hope we were saved" (Rom. 8:24). This salvation is not an uncertain desire; no, we have already received it in baptism and renewed it time after time by faith. At the same time it points towards the final and true regeneration in the resurrection. Our present possession of salvation is both real and significant. "If anyone is in Christ, he is (already) a new creation; the old has (in baptism: the aorist) passed away . . . the new has come" (repeatedly, in faith: the perfect tense). (II Cor. 5:17). "He who hears my word and believes him who sent me, has eternal life" (John 5:24). On the other hand, all that we already possess are first fruits of the age to come; especially is the Spirit a guarantee of anticipated salvation. (Rom. 8:23; II Cor. 5:5).

The eschatological nature of both kinds of temporal regeneration is also evident. The classic passage about regeneration and baptism, Titus 3:5—7, combines baptism with the hope of eternal life. The aim of baptism is the gaining of eternal life. All who are born anew in baptism are heirs of eternal life. Regeneration through the Word is similarly described. The most characteristic sentence in the whole Gospel of John is John 5:25: "Truly, truly, I say to you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live". Every occasion on which the word of Christ is heard, is an eschatological hour. It is an hour of regeneration: the dead become alive. Regeneration in faith, resurrection through the Word, is here and now, and it is to be continually renewed. However, there is only one eschatological hour, that which is to come, and all hours in this age are only a preparation for the final and proper hour of salvation. They are no mere analogy; there is an actual continuity between the hours of regeneration and that of the resurrection. Therein lies the secret of the Christian life, that the same divine voice heard in proclamation of the Gospel will one day penetrate the tombs and raise all from the dead. "The hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth, those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of judgment" (John 5:28—29).

This general exposition of New Testament eschatology has both individual and collective scope. Baptism and spiritual life are individual and personal matters. Everybody is baptised separately; the awakening of faith is a most private event. However, baptism and faith are possible only within the Church which is the body of Christ. The death and resurrection of Christ have brought about this collective communion, and all Christian life is common life in the body of Christ. The final regeneration is, similarly, an individual and a collective event. We die alone and separately. But we shall be raised from the dead together, at the gathering of the Church of Christ at His coming. In the light of the New Testament hope, this "day" will be a turning point for all human "history". From the New Testament viewpoint there is no way of studying hope for the future of human society and the Christian assurance of eternal life separately, and apart from the Parousia of Christ. Our Christian hope has several aspects, yet the eschatological Gospel is one.

If we heed the New Testament's eschatology, we may avoid all extremes in our proclamation and interpretation of the Gospel. We shall avoid Catholic sacramentalism, a mechanical system of salvation

through baptism and other church institutions. But we shall also reject psychologism, a view and method of salvation in which — following Reformed models — spiritual life is concentrated in one crucial experience of conversion. Such a special over-emphasis of certain biblical sayings surely removes them far from the totality of New Testament eschatology.

"We were saved in hope." But when we thus lay stress on the future, we do not present any apocalyptic variation of Christianity. Salvation is not merely a future event which does not concern temporal life and estranges the Christian from his daily duties. "Realized Eschatology" is largely justified. Salvation is a present reality, for Christ has come and has overcome the powers of darkness by His death and resurrection. The experiences of the individual Christian are, in that sense, corollaries of Christ's fate. On the other hand we must point out—in consideration of Realized Eschatology—that New Testament eschatology has two focal points, not just one: the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and also His coming in power. A right balance, even in the contemporary proclamation and interpretation of the Gospel, demands that both central facts be observed.

The practical application of this eschatological aspect is manifold. Christian preaching is always hopeful. Neither the individual, nor society, nor the Church will be complete, perfect. Justification of the sinner by faith is the central doctrine of all Christianity. It is also a very strong motive for active Christian life. Since salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed, since night, the old age, is far gone, and the day is at hand, we have to "cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light", the garb of the age to come (Rom. 13:11—12).

THE ECUMENICAL WORLD

The Lutheran Contribution in Evanston

The Lutheran contribution to the ecumenical movement in the Evanston Assembly was greater than at any other meeting in recent times. It is a natural result of participation in ecumenical activities on the part of this generation of church leaders. There is no longer any strange feeling or sense of being outsiders in such an organization as the World Council of Churches. Lutherans are at home in the ecumenical movement.

Our Lutheran Church has insisted that our chief contribution could be made in theological work. It is our conviction that unity can be achieved only when there is unity in confession of faith. This insistence on discussion of basic beliefs has sometimes been misunderstood both by other church groupings and by leaders of the ecumenical movement. In Evanston and in its preparation there was opportunity for discussion und study of theological problems which must be faced if there are to be further steps to unity. We are thankful that the World Council of Churches is giving the churches the opportunity to engage in this theological debate.

In the preparatory work for this great assembly Lutheran theologians from both Europe and the USA participated fully and responsibly. The Advisory Committee on the theme set up by the World Council's Executive was a forum for a presentation and discussion of our contribution. While it is true that our possibilities were not always realized in all of the sub-themes we are satisfied that on the whole our participation was respected and desired. It is not easy in these early stages to achieve the best use of all the resources available. The factors of time, distance, money are important in any consideration of better utilization of adequate church representation.

We were better prepared to enter fully into the work of this assembly than we were for instance in Amsterdam and in other ecumenical gatherings. We were there not as observers, but as participants. A sense of familiarity made it possible to take our place naturally in the meeting. We attended not as representatives of the Lutheran World Federation, nor as a bloc watching out for special interests but as partners in a great task. Let me briefly review some of the factors which made it easier for us to contribute our responsible share to this assembly.

Our Lutheran churches have become more aware of the difficult, yet extremely important ecumenical tasks in recent years. The fact that we have been confronted by both a growing awareness of our confessional position and unity and by our responsibility toward all other churches means that our churches have had to deal with these questions more than at any other time in their history. Contrary to the belief of some that confessional movements have weakened ecumenical participation, Lutherans would assert that we can engage more seriously and responsibly in unity discussions now that we have found our own inner unity. There is no disposition to stop with our own tasks as Lutherans but rather a greater eagerness to do our job in the ecumenical world.

It is also true that the leaders of our Lutheran churches served as leaders of the World Council of Churches and are acquainted with the concerns of Lutheranism and the wider ecumenical work.

Our churches were better prepared to shoulder their share of responsibility in the Evanston Assembly because of the discussion carried on by the Department of Theology and its commission. One remembers that the Executive Committee of the LWF spent considerable time in Trondheim in discussion of the ecumenical task and advanced our thinking. The Theology Department

also planned the pre-assembly conference in Chicago which attempted to help our delegation in being better prepared to contribute in this meeting. The new "Lutheran World" had also set aside the first two issues for articles on the main theme and the sub-topics. These elements in our Lutheran preparation indicate that delegates were better prepared to take a responsible part in this assembly. It is significant that almost all of the confessional groupings used the occasion to confront the ecumenical task. Our meeting in Chicago was evidence that there was need for more debate and discussion on this position.

In the Assembly itself Lutherans took every opportunity to make a generous contribution to almost every aspect of the meeting. Our theologians in the plenary assembly were given ample place even though the American press did not always understand what these men were saying. It is the opinion of many of us that the clear biblical emphasis in the assembly created a congenial atmosphere in which we Lutherans feel very much at home. As long as the ecumenical movement drives us to the Scriptures and the living Christ there will be no fear and no suspicion on the part of Lutherans of the ecumenical movement. While we do not arrogate to ourselves the sole responsibility for this emphasis within the Assembly, Lutherans have had a large part in this emphasis.

The theological discussion in Evanston was a healthy thing for all of us. Lutherans are happy to have had a share in this work. It is extremely difficult, and not desirable, to be specific, or to point to detailed contributions at special places in the Assembly. In fact, we cannot at this point in our perspective of Evanston measure or fully describe the degree to which Lutherans made an impact on this meeting. It was not only in the advance preparations and in the theological debate, but in the leadership in committees and groups within the meeting itself that the role of Lutherans was significantly present.

The Assembly has given us many additional tasks as a responsible church within this world-wide fellowship. It would be ever more appropriate to speak of what the Evanston assembly did for our churches and in what way it has created new opportunities under God for even greater tasks ahead.

Carl E. Lund-Quist

FROM THE WORK OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

Theology

Theological Conferences in America

The theological conferences of the Lutheran World Federation, held in Europe since 1948, were of tremendous importance for theological co-operation within World Lutheranism. The encounter of American and European theologians lecturing at these meetings not only provided information about the common direction of theological work in both continents, but it also corrected many prejudices.

This year was the first time that such theological conferences were attempted in the United States. The Assembly of the World Council in Evanston provided an excellent opportunity to invite European theologians to participate in smaller conferences as well. When the preparation of such conferences was first suggested to the US National Committee of the LWF, only a very few were actually contemplated. But the USA Committee decided to hold eight regional conferences to provide every American pastor with the opportunity to attend one of them.

Naturally, this arrangement required considerable financial sacrifice on the part of the American hosts. But beyond that it demanded extremely complicated preparations in order to take care of even the minor needs of the European guests. Dr. Empie and his assistant, Pastor Carroll, accomplished an astonishing amount of preparatory work, and thus everything ran smoothly at the conferences. The latter also provided transportation for the European lecturers, and for 10,000 miles through the continent he proved a host who sacrificed himself to the last drop of his physical strength. The thanks which every member of the "travelling theology department" owes him can hardly be sufficiently expressed.

More than 1,000 American Lutheran pastors answered the call to these eight conferences. Parkland, Washington, had proportionally the largest number of participants, since every other pastor of the region covered by the invitation was present. In Black Mountain, North Carolina, every fourth pastor of the region attended, even though this included distant Florida. The interest these pastors showed must surely be explained by their deep feeling of responsibility for the work of the LWF. I myself was shamed by the thought of how many of my own church would have responded to such an invitation. It is a gratifying experience, but a humbling one for Europeans, to learn to what extent the parish pastor feels himself responsible for the LWF. My experience makes it seem inconceivable that there should be even a single minister—or his congregation with him—without knowledge about the LWF.

Our concern in this first effort on American soil was to establish some familiarity with the theological work of the World Federation. Perhaps that is another reason why interest ran so high. But whoever was present, thus I was frequently assured, would surely not be absent the next time either; rather, he would most likely bring along another brother.

The worship services left a deep impression. Here all the participants united in prayer for those who today are persecuted for the sake of their Christian faith. This was a permanent part of the program, thanks to Pastor Carroll's initiative. Beyond that, he showed his close ties with his European brethren-in-the-faith in the brilliant "introductions" of the speakers, these introductions which seem indispensable to an American audience. Here the names of Berggrav, Lilje, and Ordass were ever present, as was the memory of the tested churches in the East.

The theme for the regional conferences was the same as in Evanston: "Jesus Christ—the Hope of the World." The various lectures were to throw light on this theme as one which should rouse today's Christendom to self-examination and common confession. Three exegetical studies were to provide an introduction into the Biblical message of our hope. In addition, six lectures led to a discussion not only of the main theme for Evanston but also of its relevance to several "sub-themes" (church unity, responsibility for evangelism, and vocation). Throughout, the talks were of the highest quality. What European theologians noticed most quickly was the way in which the newer American theology deals with the same problems, and the seriousness with which the struggle for a solution of the given questions is undertaken. That, theologically, there was nothing to be learnt from America sometimes appeared as a ridiculously outdated thesis to us. There was surprising harmony between the European and American lectures. It went without saying that under these circumstances theological consensus became a reality. This ought to be noted gratefully in glad anticipation of further perfection of this consensus through future co-operation.

The talks were followed by discussion. Only rarely could group study be undertaken. Wherever it was attempted nonetheless, one had to reckon with terrible overloading of the schedule and was in danger of overworking the speakers. Nevertheless, it is true that the results were best wherever group work could prepare the general discussion. In the groups much could be covered which might have been of insufficient interest for the total conference. At the same time, questions to the speakers could be worked out with much greater precision than was attained by the generalities with which the poor lecturers were frequently confronted if the discussion followed right upon the talk. At times it appeared that the lecturer was regarded as an omniscient miracle man, an expert on everything from European politics to the problems of American denominationalism. At any rate, sometimes it was a shocking experience to the European to find that his talk had not stimulated any thought, that, rather, the questions asked had barely any relevance to the lecture though they were of current concern to the American pastor.

It should not be thought, however, that this can simply be dismissed with the slogan "practical Americans—theorizing Europeans". For it also happened that the European had to ask his American brethren to put the questions somewhat more existentially. Most of the questions were well founded, theologically and pastorally vital. The difficulty was precisely in the fact that they were simply "questions". An actual "conversation" rarely occurred. In this irenic atmosphere one was, eventually, relieved if something "exploded" and set minds moving.

What I realize only now is that the American method of questioning operates on a different level. Perhaps I may express this by saying that the average American frequently shows a certain confidence in authorities. He questions a personality who, in his opinion, has the necessary qualifications satisfactorily to answer the questions which occupy him. Of course, the confidence is touching, but the responsibility which under such circumstances attaches to the chosen authority is almost overwhelming. That is why the speakers sometimes refused to regard themselves as qualified to answer certain questions. Most of the conferences showed clearly that an answer to essential questions could grow only out of joint study and exchange of ideas. It was a magnificent thing to have shared this understanding with the American speakers and thus, with them, have attempted a common advance in the area of theological problems.

America is hungry, theologically. This is ever again a humbling experience when one considers the European continent's theological satiety. Here with us, there is barely a theological thesis whose validity has not

been questioned. In contrast, the American conferences were refreshingly free of the sickness of European snobbishness which can prove its theological intelligence only by questioning every idea it meets. That there is theological hunger in America is proved, firstly, by the fact that one is truly hard at work there; but secondly also by the phenomenon of people still able to listen, still able to absorb something —even though it be not the product of their own thought. Expectations of brotherly help through the theological thought of the Old World surely run high, but they pour from a truly humble heart. American Lutherans will, without any doubt, create and develop their own theology. This will not take place painlessly. Birth is ever connected with death—even theological birth. In standing up under these theological trials American Lutheranism finds its ties with European theology of extraordinary significance.

Finally, one more question: did these conferences have any immediate significance for American church life? I think I must answer this in the affirmative, for the reason that the conferences constituted a visible step on the way towards unity for American Lutheranism. They were attended by pastors of the various member churches of the National Lutheran Council. It was inevitable that these men, joined together for the first time at a theological meeting, should depart with the impression that theological unity—that consensus of doctrine which, according to Lutheran understanding, represents the only measure of church unity—is not a far distant dream but a present possibility. There are differences, surely, but they can no longer be equated theologically with the divisions between the various church bodies. This should affect organization as well. The question which must be answered is this: do the differences actually appear in the area of intolerable divergence in doctrine? If so, that should be stated and discussed openly; but if not, then the unity of American Lutheranism must be sought and presented much more urgently than hitherto.

This and similar questions were discussed at the conference not only between individuals but in public. Thus the extraordinary theological significance of these conferences may have its effect in practical church life, especially if they may be continued, as was desired and promised by all. And such a result of a theological undertaking would constitute the best proof that the American demand for a theology which is not merely a professional mental fencing match but which must prove its truth in the church is not only justified, but can actually be carried out as the work of the Holy Spirit.

Vilmos Vajta

World Missions

Meeting of the Commission on World Missions in Hoekelum (Holland) October 22—29

The annual session of the Commission on World Missions had to deal with such a host of important single issues that the highly significant preliminary studies on the transformation of mission territories into independent churches —advanced so much by just the previous session (Bethel)—dropped somewhat into the background, at least on the agenda. But it should not be overlooked that several of the separate problems which came up are directly connected with this long-range goal.

Of such special problems we want to mention first of all the arrangements for the first All Africa Lutheran Conference to take place November 12—22, 1955 in Marangu, Tanganyika, close to Mt. Kilimanjaro. 62 delegates from 10 African lands (Ethiopia, Eritrea, Tanganyika, Rhodesia, Madagascar, South Africa, Southwest Africa, Nigeria, Liberia and the French Sudan) will discuss Africa's problems at the conference which will not have a special general theme. The growing Church in Africa, the questions she raises and the tasks she creates, will play a special role here.

This growing and increasingly independent Church in Africa and Asia has one most urgent need in the present stage of her development: Christian people from her own ranks with the gifts and training to lead and educate the congregations: teachers, evangelists, pastors, and professors. In non-Christian countries there is a more urgent need for Christian Universities than in Europe; where they exist, such universities have to struggle against greater obstacles than they would find in Western countries, without being able to look for direct outside help. This was illustrated by the reports on Nommensen University, recently founded by the Batak Church on Sumatra. Its first two Departments, theology and law, opened this October.

The most effective aid which the Western Churches can render at the moment is the granting of exchange scholarships, and this not only to theologians and future pastors, but also to Christian laymen from the younger churches. Altogether, 114 such scholarships have been given out since 1945. It is hoped that this figure can be raised considerably by soliciting churches, universities, colleges and student organizations. The Department of World Missions will co-operate closely with the Department of World Service and the Department of Theology in raising the funds and in selecting suitable student applicants.

There are two other projects likely to be realized in the near future, at least in part. The first envisages a theological research and training institution at Gurukul near Madras, expanding the existing theological school. It could provide a fitting celebration of the jubilee of Protestant Mission activity, which first began there, 250 years ago. Secondly, there is an intention to set up a special training institution for African and Asian church leaders, either in Europe (Hamburg has been specifically mentioned) or in America. A special committee has been authorized to take steps towards an early realization of this plan. The following are members of this committee: Dr. Fredrik A. Schiotz, chairman of the Commission on World Missions; Pastor Einar Amdahl, director of the Norwegian Missionary Society; Professor Walter Freytag, chairman of the German Evangelical Missions Council; Dr. Heinrich Meyer, vice-chairman of the Commission on World Service; and Dr. George F. Hall, the executive secretary of the Commission on Young Churches and Orphaned Missions, in the USA. In addition, Dr. Fridtjov Birkeli, director of the LWF Department of World Missions and Dr. Carl E. Lund-Quist, executive secretary of the LWF, are ex officio members.

The discussions of the last previous meeting of the Commission, in Bethel, July 20—24, had produced two studies devoted to what is actually the main problem of current mission activity. It is this: the transformation into autonomous churches of what have hitherto been mission fields, and the resultant possibility of their admission into the Lutheran World Federation as independent member churches. The concrete issue concerns the doctrinal foundation and the constitution of any such church. Papers had been requested from Dr. Heinrich Meyer on the former point and from Director Arvid Bäfverfeldt on the latter. Both are intended as steps in the continuation of that important discussion which is open to all; neither is, by any means intended as a final solution. They are printed below, with some abridgments of no moment to the material content of the statements.

Hans Bolewski

Study on the Transmission of our Faith as a constitutive Element in the Growth of the Younger Churches

I. Survey

It will be necessary to state as precisely as possible what attitude the various Lutheran churches and missions have adopted towards the use of the confessional writings in transmitting the faith to the younger churches. We need not aim at a comprehensive historical account nor prepare a

general questionnaire for that purpose, as three types of attitude—each markedly different from the others—can be clearly recognized. Each attitude may be observed in two or three typical instances:

A. The confessional books were translated into the vernacular to be used as a kind of textbook for instruction in dogmatics.
   1. To what extent have missionaries succeeded in translating all the confessional books (including e.g. the Smalcald Articles and the Formula Concordiae)?
   2. To what extent have these books (including the Augsburg Confession) proved useful in the instruction of the younger churches?
   3. To what extent has the Small Catechism gained a separate place entirely its own?
   4. To what extent and why has a reaction set in against the confessional books among Lutherans of the younger churches?

The Tamil and Gossner Evangelical-Lutheran Churches in India and perhaps one of the Lutheran churches in South Africa or in Madagascar might be studied as typical representatives of this approach.

B. The confessional writings (including the Small Catechism) were not passed on to the younger churches, but care was taken that the missionaries were convinced Lutherans. They preached the Gospel on the basis formulated in the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church.

Here two questions arise: how far was the character of the emerging church truly Lutheran; what are the distinctive features of churches growing out of such missionary work?

Examples to be studied for this type of approach are the Lutheran Church in New Guinea (Neuendettelsau Mission) and, to some extent perhaps, the Batak Church. (Here, however, the sending of definitely Lutheran missionaries was never made a matter of principle. Also, at least the Small Catechism was introduced.)

C. The confessional books were accepted as expressing the faith of the missionaries and as binding for them. The younger churches were not bound in the same degree but were led to formulate their own confession in terms of their own thinking, time, place, and environment.

The questions to be studied here are:

1. To what extent do such confessions reflect the confession of their spiritual fathers?
2. How much have they changed in outlook and accentuation?
3. To what extent do these new confessions represent a common basis of faith shared with other Christian churches in Asia, beyond the bounds of the Lutheran Church?

Typical examples of this third attitude are the Federation of Evangelical-Lutheran Churches in India and the Batak Church (and possibly also the Lutheran Church in New Guinea).

II. Theological Problems

It is apparent that the facts as outlined above which provide the basis of our survey, will lead to some very serious theological problems. These need to be tackled by as many informed and interested men as possible. Three main groups of problems seem to present themselves:

A. Can anybody avoid being a "confessionalist" when he proclaims his faith? Practically all denominations, including those who repudiate creeds, have transmitted their faith bound and shaped by their own tradition. Therefore we must ask: To what extent is confessionalism an inherent and indispensable element in our proclamation of the Gospel and—on the other hand—where do the limitations and errors of confessionalism lie? Confession is confession of faith, proclamation of the Gospel, and cannot therefore be

a rigid law. Where exactly does the borderline run between our confession as an essential element of our faith, and the misuse of our confession as a law binding others instead of freeing them?

B. If confession is inseparably linked to our existence as Christians, we must ask: Where does this become evident in the life of the younger churches? It is obvious that it will first show itself not in the form of a written confessional document but e.g. in baptism rites, in marking the border between heathen and Christian, in ways of worship, etc. How far are these "confessions by ritual" truly indigenous? How far are they necessarily influenced by the spiritual fathers? How far are they confessional in character?

C. While the fact that proclamation of faith must always be a witness in which the whole man is involved makes it easy to understand why Christians of the younger churches "confess" their faith whenever they confront a non-believer, it may still be asked why a formulated, written statement of faith is required—even and especially in the younger churches. Is the need for a formulated confession based upon the fact that—as in the times of primitive Christianity—we do not live and witness as a multitude of Christian individuals, but as a congregation, as a church, i.e. as an organism which must of necessity find and formulate a common expression of faith?

The number of questions could and will almost certainly be enlarged. These three sets are mentioned only to indicate what kind of theological problems they are.

III. Practical Conclusions

The survey and theological evaluation of the facts may lead to some practical conclusions concerning the attitude of Lutheran churches towards other denominations, to church unions, and to the problem of when a younger church should be considered a Lutheran church und given the right of membership in the LWF. Two facts make it probable that such practical conclusions may be drawn as will force us to reconsider certain past policies governing our relations with other churches and denominations, particularly in the area of the younger churches:

A. No church (with the possible exception of the Church of Rome) preaches *herself* among non-Christians; all of them preach Jesus Christ as the only Lord and Saviour. In other words, the proclamation of the Gospel in heathen lands is far more unanimous and far less a field for confessional differentiation and strife than it is in the West.

B. The authority of Holy Scripture is more firmly established in the younger churches than in the West where critical theology has done much to undermine confidence in the Word of God as the one unfailing guide and rule of Christian life, faith and thought. Naturally, there are differences of interpretation in the younger churches, and there may even be more in the future (nourished mainly by missionaries from the West), but that has not shaken—yet—the confidence of the overwhelming majority in the Bible as the Word of God to which we can appeal against all human opinion and doctrine.

These two factors have created a situation which is markedly different from that in the West. It may make church union possible in the East between denominations which cannot overcome their differences in the West.

Before the first two stages of the study have been completed, however, it is too early to consider these practical conclusions. They are mentioned here because it will be of value to keep such facts and possibilities in our minds while we are working on the first two stages of the study. How these practical conclusions may be dealt with effectively, can be decided later.

Heinrich Meyer

Comparative Studies on Constitutions of Younger Churches

What constitutes a Lutheran Church? The following list of standards by which to determine membership in the Lutheran World Federation (LWF) has been drawn up by the Executive Committee of the Federation (Oxford, July, 1949) and expanded by the Commission on World Missions (CWM) (Bethel, July, 1953). The three standards outline the minimum essentials in a younger church qualifying for membership in the LWF and answer the question: "What constitutes any Lutheran Church?" I quote the standards in the order stressed by CWM (Minutes of July, 1953, p. 22):

I. A Lutheran confessional basis, regulative of the church's life;

II. Autonomy and progress in the direction of self-support and self-propagation;

III. Discipline of its pastors.

These three standards give us the main topics of our study.

I. Confessional Basis

Each of these churches professes that the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments are the revealed Word of God and are therefore the only source and authority for faith, doctrine, and life. Most of these churches—all except the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Zulu Church, which mentions none, and the Huria Kristen Batak Protestant, which mentions only the Apostolicum—list the three Ecumencial Symbola. The Augustana Invariata and Luther's Small Catechism are common to all.

Nineteen churches include all the other Lutheran confessions of the Book of Concord, but the Apology is mentioned by only twelve. Some churches list these other confessional documents in a subordinate section; (for instance: A. the UELC of Argentina: Section 1. The Bible; Section 2. The Ecumenical Symbola; Section 3. Augustana Invariata; Section 4. The other confessional books of the Lutheran tradition; B. the Andhra ELC*) which, however, puts the Apology in Section 3.)

Most of the younger churches of German or American origin (except those in Tanganyika and China) have received all the Lutheran symbolic books from their parent missions. Most churches with Scandinavian background have the Bible, the Ecumenical Symbola, Augustana and Luther's Small Catechism only. (Exceptions to this are the ELC Madhya Pradesh, founded by EFS, and the ELC Ethiopia, founded by EFS and the Hermannsburg Mission. These have the Book of Concord.) The Nias Mission constitution is the only one making no reference to its theological basis.

Some churches declare that the doctrinal statement cannot be amended.

The ecumenical attitude varies: some churches give evidence of belonging not only to the Lutheran family but to the whole Christian "Catholic" church. This is very definitely the case with the Ebenezer ELC, the African LC of South Africa, the Batak Church, the Lutheran Church of Northern Tanganyika, the ELC Madhya Pradesh, the Sirkali ELC, and the churches of Scandinavian origin or influence in southern Africa and Tanganyika.

The Andhra ELC hints at co-operation outside the Lutheran fold and so do several others. The Tamil ELC "while praying for the unity of all Christians, recognizes as bodies with full right of intercommunion all churches adopting the Unaltered Augsburg Confession". Some do not mention their relation to non-Lutheran churches; others stress the Lutheran heritage in words which show their exclusively Lutheran attitude. Thus the Lutheran Church of Mexico is anxious to stress the principle of "Lutheran pulpits for

---

*) Abbreviations used in this article are: ELC = Evangelical Lutheran Church; EFS = Swedish Evangelical Society Mission; UELC = United ELC; LC = Lutheran Church; EC = Evangelical Church; and then there are, of course, CWM = Commission on World Missions and LWF = Lutheran World Federation.

Lutheran pastors only, and Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only". The South Andhra LC, following the Andhra ELC almost word for word in its theological basis, differs in its ecumenical attitude in that it excludes any expression of wider co-operation (Const. III, 2c, 7).

There must be "a Lutheran confessional basis, with these confessions regulative of its life" (LWF). This basis must be clearly expressed in an unalterable article in the constitution of a Lutheran church, but not necessarily by including "Lutheran" in the name of the church.

What is the minimum definition of its Lutheran character and confession required of a young church in the mission field?

A. A Lutheran church belongs to the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. This ecumenical affinity is expressed in the constitution by reference to the Holy Scriptures and the three Ecumenical Symbola. These Symbola stand for:

1) The continuity within the Church of Christ, the Apostolic heritage and the true Christian doctrine on the most vital points;

2) The unity of the Church today as the foundation of all true ecumenicity.

Since these Symbola are included in the constitutions they must be translated into the language of each Church, printed and distributed at least to the clergy and other leaders, who should know and understand them.

Yet the question arises whether it is sufficient for a younger church to have the Apostolic Confession only, in its constitution. (The Nicene Creed can be used for liturgical purposes and the Athanasian seems hardly relevant today in a younger church, though it was this creed that once, in the old church, defended the Second Article of the Apostolic Creed.

B. What is the minimum definition required to establish the Lutheran character of the confession of the church? Should we aim at a minimum rather than a maximum? The answer should be yes, so that the indigenous church can have scope for development within the conditions of her non-Christian surroundings, her special problems concerning new heresies, etc.

The Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism are both basic documents. Some missions have introduced all the documents from the Book of Concord into the constitutions of younger churches, but this may prove an unnecessary burden of tradition rather than a help to the church concerned

The indispensable gifts entrusted to the Lutheran Church should be sifted out and safeguarded in the younger church. But to fight heresy and defend the true and full Gospel in such a church, it may not be sufficient to give it, without amplification, the Augsburg Confession which deals partly with problems of 16th century Europe as distinct from those of our time and of the younger church. Augustana stands for something indispensable but should be augmented by statements pointing to the present situation of the church. (This has been pointed out by experts such as Dr. B. Sundkler and Dr. H. Meyer.)

The doctrinal statements of the younger church should safeguard and guide its development towards becoming a living member not only of the Lutheran body but of the CORPUS CHRISTI.

II. Autonomy

The degree of autonomy the younger churches have attained varies from total dependence upon the mother church to more or less complete independence. The constitutions therefore differ greatly in content, e. g. in the powers entrusted to their respective administrative bodies, in patterns of government, etc.

On the whole, the aim of these churches is to become "self-governing, self-supporting and self-propagating". If we consider "the progress in the direction of autonomy" from these

three aspects, three corresponding stages can be seen:

A. Dependence on the mother church;
B. Co-operation between church and mission;
C. Independence.

In each stage the degree of development varies greatly. A church is seldom "self-propagating" without any help from the mission. Only a few have reached the final stage (e. g. the Batak, China, Gossner and Northern Tanganyika Churches). In churches without complete autonomy the highest authority (in policy decisions, approval of budgets, and amending of constitutions) is vested in the home boards. Principal leadership is in the hands of the missions and missionaries are selected and sent by them, though they are responsible to the church authorities in their work (e. g. in the Tamil ELC and the ELC Madhya Pradesh).

The "Guide for Qualifying for Membership in the LWF" (Agenda CWM 1953) states: "There has always been a disposition to interpret liberally the word 'self-support', and in admitting ... 'younger churches' it has usually been regarded sufficient if they give evidence over the years of moving steadily in the direction of self-support. But ... not to admit as a member church an organization that is bound organically to some other church."

Complete "self-support" should not be a condition for autonomy (Tambaram Mission Conference). The fact that an indigenous church receives financial help from the home board should not be a pretext for exercising outside influence in the church's government. (Many "sending churches" which co-operate with the state, as in Scandinavia and Germany, are neither completely "self-governing" nor "self-supporting".)

Autonomy means "not to be bound organically to some other church". A younger church dependent upon the mother church for organization and leadership is not autonomous.

In order to clarify the position of the indigenous church and to guide it "in the direction" of full autonomy, it is advisable to divide the constitution of a younger church co-operating with a mission into two parts, preferably even two documents:

1. The constitution proper of the church;
2. Regulations governing the co-operation between the church and the mission.

The first should be indited so that it may continue as the church develops in maturity. The second document may have to be changed from time to time (without effect on the first), depending on the condition of the mission and the church's development.

The three "selfs", more than a hundred years old, are now slightly out-of-date (Whitby, Willingen mission conferences). We should speak instead of autonomous churches in common responsibility. "Complete independence" must never grow into isolation. All churches, both "sending" and "receiving", should co-operate—not least in ("self")-propagating the Gospel by co-ordinated world mission activity.

A. Patterns of Government

There are several patterns of government in these churches. The main picture is: synodical order with

1. The Synod or General Assembly (Great Synod);
2. Synodal Council (Church Council, Church Board, Mahasabha);
3. Executive Committee;
4. Boards on Evangelism, Education, Finance, Medical Work, etc.;
5. Standing Committees on Literature, Youth Work, Women's Work, etc.;
6. Ministerium (Pastors' Conference);
7. District Council (District Synod);
8. Local Congregational Council (Church Council, Congregational Committee).

There are seats in the leading councils for some missionaries, but they are in the minority (with some exceptions, e. g. S. Africa). In some more advanced churches there are none (China, Japan, Batak, Gossner).

B. Officers

Most constitutions call the head of their churches "president" or "superintendent", specifying that he shall be an ordained minister. The Batak Church has two heads: an ephorus and a general secretary. Some consider a bishop (Tamil ELC, Swedish Zulu Church, ELC New Guinea) or an episcopal order (ELC Madhya Pradesh, Arcot LC, ELC S. Rhodesia, African LC of South Africa and EC of Buhaya).

Generally the church head is elected by the Church, but the appointment must be confirmed by the home board; or the head of the mission is the ex-officio head of the church.

Episcopacy stands for continuity with the Apostolic Church (1 Tim. 1:5 f; 3:1 f) and has a recognized, first-rank place in Lutheran tradition. The Episcopate in Lutheran tradition (Germany, Scandinavia) is not of the same character as in the Anglican. The bishop is "primus inter pares" of the clergy, he is elected for life; a president (superintendent) is elected for a period of 4—5 years only.

The episcopal order has proved useful to many churches in consolidating their position—not least in times of trouble—and in fighting disunity and separation (CWM Agenda 1953, Exhibit A p. 1). Especially in Africa it corresponds to the prevailing tradition. Here the episcopal order in the Lutheran church gives strength against Roman Catholic pressure and in contact with the Anglican neighbor churches.

The existence of an episcopal order in one church has created no difficulties of co-operation with other Lutheran churches (S. Africa, India). (Compare the German churches.)

In general, powers entrusted to the head of the church are: to preside at meetings, direct the church, visit congregations, ordain ministers.

Other officers are: vice-president, secretary and treasurer.

III. Clergy

The third standard provided by the resolution of the LWF is "discipline of its pastors". This emphasizes the importance—not least in the younger church—of pastoral leadership and example. Many churches list the qualifications of pastors in the constitution itself (Tanganyika, S. Africa, Gossner, Amboland). Sometimes, rules for the clergy are contained in the by-laws.

The main duties of a clergyman are: to preach and administer the Holy Sacraments, to prepare his sermons carefully, to minister to his congregation according to the rules of the church, to visit Christian homes and devote proper time to the pastoral care of souls, to approach non-Christians in his area and encourage his congregation in evangelistic activity; to be responsible for the church register; to continue his theological studies.

Among the rights of a clergyman are these: to receive a regular salary; to have at his disposal a parsonage built and maintained by the parish; to be a member of the Synod.

The pastor shall refrain from engaging in business or in any other work which hinders or is not compatible with his pastoral calling. If he persists in such activity, he shall resign.

Should a pastor violate church rules or disqualify himself in any other way from the ministry, he can be suspended for a certain time and barred from doing any pastoral work or receiving salary. In serious cases he will be dismissed from the ministry. If under church discipline, the pastor must return his certificate of ordination and his gown to the head of the church.

IV. Membership and Church Discipline

A. There is little uniformity in the stipulations of the various constitutions about acceptance of members. Some do not mention it.

The main rule is that members are accepted through baptism. Children of Christian families are baptized and others also, if Christian education can be guaranteed. The Godfather institution is of particular importance in the latter cases. Those baptized by other denominations are admitted after instruction in Lutheran doctrine and

after having expressed their adherence to the same. Members of other Lutheran churches can be accepted by a letter of transfer.

B. All churches provide for disciplinary action, usually consisting of temporary exclusion from Holy Communion and—if no repentance is shown—complete expulsion from the church. The most usual offences are departure from the true faith, manifest sin, immoral conduct, wilful neglect of church duties, return to heathenism. This disciplinary task is entrusted to various bodies in the different churches. The Church Council (Synodal or Executive Council) usually holds final authority.

Some constitutions have articles on the conditions for re-admitting the penitent.

Cases against foreign workers (missionaries) are usually referred to the appointing home board.

V. Property and Finance

A. Quite a number of constitutions have articles on the holding of property, movable and immovable.

Mission property in the field is given over gradually to the indigenous church. When the church assumes final responsibility, all property is transferred to the church, with the exception of houses and sites occupied by missionaries (Tamil ELC).

To obtain ownership rights, the church must become a legally registered body, recognized by the government concerned. The condition for such registration is the existence of a constitution. Otherwise, private persons must step in as formal owners on behalf of the church. A registered mission can serve as trustee for a church.

B. Most churches are financially dependent on subventions from the home boards, and receive an annual subsidy according to the agreement in force. Sometimes this subsidy remains constant for a certain period (5 years), sometimes it decreases by 5% or 10% annually; after that the church should be entirely self-supporting. Some churches make a clear distinction between the responsibilities of the church and those of the mission board.

The Executive Committee (Church Council) prepares the consolidated budget of the church. Income is derived from fixed annual fees paid by every member, Sunday offerings, marriage fees, voluntary gifts such as offerings at baptism and Holy Communion services, confirmation and harvest thanksgivings.

VI. Amendments

All churches (excepting two) make provision for constitutional amendments, but the procedure varies. Some constitutions state explicitly that certain articles—usually those which establish the theological basis and those which provide for amendments—may not be altered.

The body of highest authority usually has the right to vote amendments.

VII. Other Rules and Regulations

The constitutions deal with several other matters such as: 1. Sacraments and services; 2. Elections and voting procedures; 3. Appeals and complaints; 4. Official language of meetings; 5. Standing agendas; 6. Teachers, evangelists; 7. Marriage.

As the main document of the constitution should deal with the principles and main points of the church order, there is an advantage in listing other rules and regulations in special by-laws attached to the constitution.

What should be the contents of a constitution?

A. In the main document, the following points should be dealt with: 1. Name and doctrinal basis; 2. Membership of the church; 3. Church organization (Synod, Synodal Council. District Councils, Parish Councils, the Congregation); 4. Amendments and revisions.

B. In a second document the relation between church and mission should be regulated.

C. The by-laws should cover the following: 1. Superintendent and other

officers; 2. Clergy; 3. Other offices (evangelists, teachers, elders); 4. Education; 5. Medical work; 6. Baptism, Confirmation, Marriage, Burial; 7. Church discipline; 8. Ordering of meetings (standing agendas, elections and voting procedure); 9. Property and finance; 10. Appeals and complaints; 11. Church register.

D. The order of the Holy Sacraments, liturgy and Divine Services should be contained in a church handbook.

Arvid Bäfverfeldt

Director Arvid Bäfverfeldt has served for many years a the director of the Church of Sweden Mission and formerly served as a pastor in that church. After taking part in the meeting of the International Missionary Council at Willingen 1952, he went out to the mission field for two years. He became a missionary in an area taken over by his own Mission from the German missions which had had to leave on account of the war.

It is quite unusual for a director to become an ordinary missionary for a while. But in this way he has certainly gathered invaluable experience for his continued service as Director of the Church of Sweden Mission. While out in Bukoba, he undertook a study of the different constitutions of the churches of Africa and Asia, and submitted a progress report to the annual meeting of the Commission on World Missions at Hoekelum, Holland, in October 1954. Above we print an abbreviated version of this report. The final report will presumably be available for CWM's next year's meeting. *Fridtjov Birkeli*

Request for Intercession

The Commission on World Missions of the Lutheran World Federation, at its meeting in Hoekelum, Holland, took note of the fact that the Rev. Paul Mackensen, a missionary in China, has been imprisoned since March 7, 1952. According to latest reports he is in solitary confinement. There is no information regarding the reasons for his imprisonment nor is there any record of his trial.

Pastor Mackensen was sent to Tsingtao in 1948 by the ULCA. Special efforts have been made through normal channels to secure his release and to bring him back to his homeland. These efforts, up to this time, have been unsuccessful. He is one of two Lutheran missionaries left in China.

The Commission on World Missions urges our churches to pray for Pastor Mackensen. We remember his willingness to serve the cause of Christ and His Church by preaching the Gospel to the Chinese. It is a further reminder that we should pray for all those who suffer persecution for the sake of the Gospel. We urge our people to pray that, in his loneliness, Pastor Makkensen will be strengthened by faith in Christ.

Commission on Stewardship and Congregational Life

It was most remarkable that at the last meeting of the Commission on Stewardship and Congregational Life at Kiel, October 15-20, 1954, it was a German pastor, Pastor Herbert Reich, Secretary for Stewardship in the Lutheran Church of Hannover, who gave the report (reprinted below) on the practical aspects of Stewardship.

This fact was one of the most astounding of the entire meeting. It shows better than anything else how a European church has adapted the stewardship idea of the American churches to its own situation, developed methods to suit its needs and improved existing procedures. This is noteworthy and wonderful progress! For it proves, most conclusively, that it can work in state-churches and "Volkskirchen" (Folk-churches). I predict that from now on it will spread rapidly throughout the continent of Europe.

Amazing, too, to sit in a meeting where the questions concerning method, concerning the practical aspect of stewardship were answered not by American but by German leaders.

Clarence C. Stoughton

The Work of Stewardship in the Lutheran Churches of Western Germany

I.

1. Undoubtedly, one of the results of the LWF Assembly in 1952 has been the quest for the content and aim of stewardship, carried on continuously ever since. Two published pamphlets, intended to apply the assembly's results, have helped to keep this discussion alive[1].

[1] Heinrich Rendtorff, ... *als die guten Haushalter*... (As Good Stewards), Freimund Verlag, Neuendettelsau, 1953; Walter Schäfer, *Stewardship — Der Dankdienst der Christen* (Stewardship —the Christian's Service of Gratitude), Ev. Presseverband für Bayern, München, 1953.

2. At the same time, the brotherly service of the Rev. Carl H. Mau, Jr., the representative of the LWF in Hannover, must be gratefully acknowledged. During the last four years, in hundreds of our congregations and at many pastoral conferences, he has tirelessly shown us the significance of stewardship in the life of his country's congregations. A number of films, especially the United Lutheran Church's "Like a Mighty Army", have helped both Pastor Mau and the congregations. All such occasions have stressed the New Testament foundation of Stewardship. LWF has now provided another worker, the Rev. T. A. Hartig, and this action has already proved its value.

3. Finally, our brethren in the USA can see here the fruits of their faith. The volume of the gifts of love sent to us has caused many Christians here to wonder what is the source of this inner power to practice such great and persevering love. Here again we are confronted by Stewardship.

II.

1. Work began in December 1952, when our bishop D. Dr. Hanns Lilje established a permanent working committee of 5 (including Pastor Mau), with the task of studying the existing examples of Stewardship, to prepare theologically and practically for the introduction of Stewardship in German congregations, and finally to begin the work itself.

2. Since then, 165 members of 7 Hannoverian congregations have been carefully trained as visiting evangelists, 6 other congregations have almost finished the preparatory stages, and 20—30 congregations are now studying the question of how they can begin the work. These figures are still comparatively low, since we allowed considerable time between the first training courses to discover mistakes to avoid in later congregational workshops. We have also made a first practical attempt to introduce "the Lord's Treasury Box" as the second phase of stewardship in a congregation. The "Department for Service to the Congregations", helped by church headquarters, has given this new work personnel and financial basis during its first year of operation. The first steps of the Hannoverian "Stewardship program" have been so promising that all involved have felt God's guidance and pray that He will not withdraw His hand of blessing[2].

3. Meanwhile, similar working committees have been formed by the churches of Bavaria, Brunswick, Württemberg, and Baden; in Hamburg, Schleswig-Holstein, and Lübeck groups of pastors are studying the subject. We still have insufficient insight into the Stewardship situation in East Germany, but we have established contact with the churches of Mecklenburg, Saxony and Berlin.

So far, there has been good liaison between all working committees and individuals. In future, the German National Committee of the LWF might well act to provide the framework for this co-operative effort.

III.

1. The first study on the biblical-theological foundations of Stewardship was undertaken by the working committee mentioned above, supplemented by a larger group of 20 pastors and leaders in various phases of church work. One Pastoral Study Conference of the Church of Hannover saw 25 pastors and church members spend ten days in an intensive examination of the work thus far[3]; each committee and individual had a special aspect allotted

[2] No satisfactory German translation for the word "Stewardship" has yet been found.

[3] These findings have been written up in the so-called *Loccumer Protokoll* (Loccum Minutes) and in a pamphlet written by Wilhelm Thomas: *Lebendige Gemeinde nach dem Neuen Testament und nach Luther* (The Living Congregation according to the New Testament and according to Luther), obtainable from the "Amt für Gemeindedienst", Hannover, Lutherhaus.

for study. Another such meeting is scheduled for February 1955. In addition, a 3-day meeting was held, bringing together representatives of 13 congregations for the purpose of helping them prepare for the launching of a Stewardship program. Members of other German Lutheran congregations were invited to all of these meetings.

2. The theological task and its results can be briefly described as follows:

a) it was established that Stewardship is not merely an American technique, but a biblically grounded way of life for the Christian.

b) to give meaning to the formal demand to be a faithful and wise steward we must draw on scriptural statements (one related body and its members, good works, office and functions [Amt und Ämter] etc.).

c) to formulate the compulsion to express one's Christian faith in every area of life.

d) this point (c), together with the great (missionary) commission to the Church and its individual member, led to the recognition that Stewardship and evangelism cannot be separated.

e) bringing to bear the relevant ideas of the Reformation, especially Luther's thoughts concerning the "priesthood of all believers".

3. These insights are generally known to German pastors, but are seldom applied in their ministry and therefore unfamiliar to the people. We recognized a need to interpret them so that they could be understood and applied in our situation. This was and is being done through the extensive lecturing and counselling of Pastor Mau and Pastor Reich, especially in Hannover but elsewhere also.

4. The American example could not be followed in all its details because of the different situation and tradition of the "Volkskirche" and its congregational organization.

a) There is great need for pastoral counselling in the over-large congregations, and thus visitation within the framework of Christian Stewardship (counselling and missionary visits) receives great emphasis. The following considerations arise out of this:

i) As the German pastor seeks help in his overwhelming task of counselling people, we must beware of the temptation to adopt the method of visitation and evangelism too soon, as a means to an end.

ii) An existing laymen's organization serving as a helping hand to the pastor tends to believe it is already doing what we call "Visitation in the framework of Christian Stewardship".

iii) Methods for good and careful follow-up have been developed. This is especially necessary here, because the idea that members have a real responsibility in this matter is unfamiliar[4].

b) In view of the urgency of visitation evangelism, the "Lord's Treasury" work had to take second place. (This work is intended to help our people to put aside a specific part of their income for the needs of their church. The "Lord's Treasury Box" should have a fixed place in each home and the money once put in should never be used for ordinary day-to-day expenses. There is no happier way of drawing a family together than a discussion of how this money put aside for God can best be used.) All who have worked with us have recognized that the responsible use of money entrusted to us by God is a necessary element of stewardship; a number of people in cour congregations also practice voluntary "proportionate giving". But the

[4] We have prepared a Handbook for our helpers: Herbert Reich, *Besuchsdienst in christlicher Haushalterschaft* (Visitation within the Framework of Stewardship), obtainable from the "Amt für Gemeindedienst", Hannover, Lutherhaus.

"Volkskirche" tradition and the entirely different situation of the German Churches in financial matters (church taxes!), as well as the characteristic German unwillingness to talk about money—these and other factors make for difficulties here. But although we still have much work to do, we are in good spirits!

Because young people do not share many of these problems and can hardly make counselling visits, we have recently begun to develop a plan of Stewardship for youth, to be practised with their "income". This plan follows the pattern of the "yes" plan of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, USA, and her Luther League.

IV.

1. Introducing Stewardship in our congregations is difficult because a great deal of opposition and complacency has to be overcome. That applies to the clergy as well as the congregations. Where we have succeeded in taking the first step, we find a great deal of interest and spiritual preparedness.

We have been astonished and surprised to find well qualified men and women for the necessary committees and for the active service of visitation evangelism in every congregation, so far. Even if there are seemingly few witnessing congregations in Germany, we have found many witnessing Christians who make it possible to proceed with Stewardship.

2. The situation of the "Volkskirche" makes missionary work easier; since 95 % of the population consider themselves members of the Church, the visitors are welcomed and are able to engage in deep, searching conversation far more often than we would have believed. Similarly, many more than we expected allowed themselves to be invited (and came!) to the services or congregational events.

This kind of "pastoral call" (seelsorgerischer Besuch) made by members of the congregation was taken very seriously; in only one case out of 1,000 did someone ask why the pastor had not come himself. The difficult times experienced by many Germans, the breakdown of existing standards, the lack of direction of many who do not know God cries out for pastoral care (Seelsorge).

3. We therefore see "Visitation evangelism within the framework of Christian Stewardship", and the other expressions of Stewardship also, as a God-given opportunity to lead people back to God in our time and situation. Stewardship is the special commission God has given to our generation.

Herbert Reich

The Preaching-Teaching-Reaching Evangelism Mission

In an effort to mobilize the congregations for a more effective task of evangelism, the Preaching-Teaching-Reaching Evangelism Mission was brought into being by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1952. The response of pastors and congregations to the program has been phenomenal. A frequent comment has been, "Why didn't it come years sooner?" Many congregations have experienced a new surge of spiritual life running through them. Pastors have been encouraged, spiritually built up, and trained for a more effective ministry. Thousands of Christians, most of them for the first time, have experienced the joy of bringing Christ to people and people to Christ. Scores of congregations have evidenced increased church attendance, hundreds of new members for their churches and, in general, a spiritual awakening to the challenges and purposes for which they exist. God is richly blessing the Preaching-Teaching-Reaching movement in His Church.

The Preaching

The Word of God, preached and taught in its truth and purity, is basic in Lutheran evangelism. A series of "special services" in a congregation

can do much to deepen the spiritual life of believers and to bring Christ to the unreached. In the P-T-R Mission, "guest pastors" are invited to a given area to preach Sunday morning through Thursday night. Every Lutheran congregation within a fifty to seventy-five mile radius joins in the mission, each having special services with a "guest pastor" doing the preaching. "Guest pastors" are selected by the congregations or by the Evangelism Office. Our P-T-R Missions have ranged from five congregations to one hundred six, with an equal number of guest pastors in addition to the local pastors. Pastors are urged to preach for commitment and reconsecration. No particular attempt is made to use only those pastors who have outstanding speaking ability. Because the P-T-R program is a mission to the congregations *and* the pastors, most of the clergy are enlisted for the program. God is using them each in a different way, and they in turn are enriched through their participation.

Almost without exception, more than eight hundred congregations in the E. L. C. where this program has been put on testify to much spiritual fruit as a result of the preaching missions. They serve somewhat like a "catalytic" agent, speeding up the processes of coming to faith in Christ.

The Teaching

One of the great strengths of the P-T-R Mission has been the enlistment of *parish* pastors to be the "guest pastors" in areas away from their own congregations. In order to lift and encourage all pastors in their work, the "guest" and "local" pastors meet Monday through Thursday mornings from 9:30 to 12:15 in what is called a "Mission to Ministers". Lectures by competent members of our staff, including such men as Pastor Agnar Tanner, Dr. Oscar C. Hanson, and Dr. T. F. Gullixson, conducting Bible studies and lectures on the Church, the ministry and theology. In addition, the Director of Evangelism conducts clinical sessions on parish evangelism and also instructs the pastors in methods and techniques of mobilizing, training, and using lay people in visitation work. Many have said that the entire spiritual complexion of the ministry is being changed through these sessions. They serve as a spiritual retreat and refresher course for the pastors.

The pastors' expenses, as well as all other expenses incurred in conducting the mission are paid out of offerings received at each evening service in each congregation. The offerings are "pooled" in a central treasury, and surplus funds are sent in to the evangelism office to further the work of evangelism.

The Reaching

Because of the simultaneousness of the P-T-R Mission with many congregations participating, there results a contagion which makes it easier for pastors to enlist lay people in visitation work than would be possible otherwise. Monday through Thursday during the Mission, each congregation sends forth Christian lay people to call on the unchurched, indifferent, lax, as well as the troubled, sick and shut-in. Prospects for the visitation are discovered by means of community canvasses, from sponsor, baptism, and confirmation lists in the church records, new people moving into the community, and so forth. A most effective witness for Christ is borne by Christian lay people, and endless spiritual blessings come, not only to those visited, but also to the visitors themselves. They discover "soul-winning" as the most responsible and satisfying labor undertaken in the realm of human life. Joy wells up in their souls when they see that all of life's relationships are included when Christ enters a human heart.

In 1954 in the E. L. C., 8,456 lay people have been mobilized and sent forth to bear witness of their faith in Christ; *they* made 16,876 calls and contacted 41,875 people. 1,101 people were found for the pastor's adult

class, 1,200 for baptism, 2,181 new children for the Sunday School and 4,071 for membership. We are reminded of Acts 2:47, "And the Lord added to their number day by day those who were being saved."

The Future

Recently, all of the church bodies of the National Lutheran Council have launched the P-T-R Mission as their major emphasis in evangelism. The new Director of Evangelism of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod has observed and studied the program and is soon going to introduce the plan into their church. It is Biblical, soundly Lutheran, Christ-centered, and worked in and through the congregation. God has used it to strengthen Christians in their faith and to win many for His Kingdom. With slight adaptations it could become an effective program of evangelism in almost any country in the world. We recommend it for study and consideration. We are convinced it is God's gift to our Lutheran Church for this hour and for these times in order that every congregation, under God, might more effectively meet the challenges and opportunities confronting us in our world.

Conrad M. Thompson

Committee on Latin America

The Second Latin American Lutheran Conference in Petropolis

"What is the mission of the Lutheran Church in Latin America", and "How can the world fellowship of Lutherans fulfil that mission more adequately", were the chief questions discussed at the Second Latin American Lutheran Conference held in Petropolis, Brazil, July 20—23, 1954. The conference was called by the Lutheran World Federation Committee on Latin America, and was held in Hotel Quitandinha. (The first conference had been held at Curitiba just about three years before.)

More than one hundred representatives of the Lutheran churches in Latin American countries and members of the Latin America Committee of the Lutheran World Federation and of the Division of Lutheran Cooperation in Latin America of the National Lutheran Council were present to discuss these issues. People speaking eleven different languages were represented at the conference. Their languages were Portuguese, Spanish, English, German, Hungarian, Latvian, Slovak, Norwegian, Swedish, Estonian and Danish. As Dr. Carl Lund-Quist, the executive secretary of the Lutheran World Federation, reported, only three groups of Lutherans in Latin America are officially members of the Lutheran World Federation. They are: the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Argentina, the Synodical Federation of Brazil and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in British Guiana. In addition to these groups, however, Lutheran work is being carried on in the following countries: Venezuela, Colombia, Chile, Peru, Mexico, Paraguay, Ecuador, Uruguay, Bolivia and in the Caribbean area. Practically all groups, except the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, were represented at the Conference.

Protestants in Latin America

Dr. Stewart W. Herman, director of the Latin America Committee of the Lutheran World Federation, presented the following information concerning Protestants, and especially Lutherans, in Latin America. "In the Latin American area ... there is a so-called Christian population of about 180,000,000 souls, of whom some 4,000,000 are Protestants and three-quarters of a million are Lutheran. From these figures it is apparent that the Lutheran Church occupies a rather peculiar position in Latin America. On the one hand, it resembles a tiny island in a vast Roman Catholic ocean; the island is fearful of the ocean but frequently feels superior to it. Quality, we say, is more important than quantity. On the other hand, the fact that we are the largest of all the Protestant islands gives us a sense

of ecclesiastical well-being, assuming that physical size is a reliable indication of spiritual strength." He continues in his report, "Whence, then, do our 750,000 Lutherans come? How have we arrived at the largest Protestant community in Latin America? The answer is obvious. Immigration. The same great exodus which carried Swedes, Danes, Norwegians, Dutch and Swiss into Australia, South Africa, Canada, and the United States carried them to South and Central America as well. The decisive movement occurred during the middle decades of the 19th century when many Germans settled in Brazil and Argentina. In these two countries alone we now have approximately 700,000 of our 750,000 total. The forefathers of these Lutherans came to Latin America more than 100 years ago."

Other facts of which the group was very conscious and which formed the background for the discussion of the questions concerning the mission of the Lutheran Church in Latin America were that about 98 % of the population of the Latin American area is nominally Roman Catholic and that of the 750,000 Lutherans, only about 20,000 souls are genuinely Latin.

"What is the mission of the Lutheran Church?"

A great deal of the discussion hinged on the answer to the question "What is the mission of the Lutheran Church in predominantly Roman Catholic Latin America?" It is clear that in the early years of Lutheran work in Latin America the main, if not the only, emphasis was on providing a ministry for the Lutheran immigrants in their mother tongue. There was no thought of bringing the Gospel to others in a "missionary" sense. Perhaps some quotations from papers presented at the conference will indicate what the thinking of some of these groups is today.

The presentation of the German Evangelical La Plata Synod included the following statement: "She is called 'evangelical' because it is her mission to preserve the religious heritage of our fathers and to deliver our faith to the young generation. She is called 'German' because she addresses herself to people of German descent. The word 'La Plata' shows her geographic position."

A further statement in the La Plata Synod report was: "The Synod does not consider it her task to do missionary work among the Catholics in the countries of her activity. Her work among people of German descent and evangelical affiliation is so broad that it claims all her spiritual energies."

In the greeting from the Lutheran World Federation Committee in Sweden was the following sentence: "We are happy that the Lutheran World Federation work in Latin America will help our scattered Swedes in this continent to be reached by the Word of God."

It would be totally unfair to say that among the groups quoted above there is no interest in bringing the message of the Gospel to those who are nominally Roman Catholic. However, it does show where the emphasis lies and where the major portions of time and energy have gone in the past and where a large emphasis is still being placed.

However, there were others at the conference who gave a different answer. Pastor P. Karle, in speaking about "The task of our Synods", had this to say: "The task of our Synods is decidedly not different from that of any other evangelical Lutheran church: to preach the pure and true Gospel and to administer properly the Holy Sacraments."

"This task we must fulfil in countries predominantly Roman Catholic and in congregations whose members often vary greatly as to origin, language and ecclesiastical tradition."

However, the thinking of a majority of those attending the conference, in my opinion, was expressed by the Rev. A. C. Morck, in his paper "Our Lutheran Witness to Latin Americans". The following are significant quotations from that paper: "The reason for the Reformation is the same reason which necessitates the evangelical missionary witness in Latin America today. To

deny this need and our responsibility for the Roman Catholic world is to deny that the Reformation was justifiable. We need not apologize for the historical aspects of our existence. We trace our origin clearly and directly back through the ecumenical creeds to the Apostolic Church and its Divine Founder, and even in speaking of denominations or the existing division within present-day Christendom, we are about a generation older than the Roman Catholic Church. As a denomination, we date from Augsburg, 1530; the Roman Catholic Church from Trent, 1545—63. If the Reformation was justifiable in the 16th century, its message is not only justifiable but urgently needed in the 20th century when we face not only the errors so tenaciously defended at Trent but also those of the subsequent dogmas, each one of which militates against some important phase of our faith in Christ as Saviour and Lord and consistently diverts the devotion of the individual from Christ to Mary."

Another paragraph in Pastor Morck's paper was as follows: "When the congregations of European origin outgrow their present existence as foreign islands in Latin America and become an integral part of the life of this continent, they will become a most powerful missionary force. This hope is borne out by the history of Lutheranism in North America where it is no longer a 'foreign church' and is now receiving into its congregations by the thousands the unchurched from all national backgrounds."

The Rev. Ake Kastlund, a pastor from Sweden who is serving the Lutheran World Federation Committee in South America, said in his report to the Committee that he was not certain that it was right to get the Swedish people into chapters for worship and then not be able to give them a pastor. This question stems partly from the fact that many of the Swedes to whom he ministered were in South America on a temporary basis and expected to return to Sweden again in a year or so. Another reason was, of course, that there were few in these groups who thought of their congregation as one that should bring the message to those with whom they lived, in the language of the country in which they were now staying.

Lutheran groups in Latin America

The fact that there are so many immigrants in Latin America who are Lutherans presents an opportunity to the Lutheran Church at the present time, and yet, at the same time, it presents a temptation to make the Lutheran Church a "foreign church" who does not fulfil the mission that she has in Latin America where there is so much indifference to a living vital faith in Jesus Christ. There is a feeling among those who were born in Latin America and who are of Latin American background that the Lutheran Church is being weakened as a dynamic factor in the life of Latin America because the immigrants of Lutheran background tend to form a "foreign church" and lack a sense of mission. There are, however, many among the immigrants and among those who minister to these immigrants who realize that here is a real opportunity for the Lutheran Church in a predominantly Roman Catholic country to express her faith and life in such a way that her real witness will become clear to the people of Latin America.

The Lutheran World Federation Committee has as its aim the establishment of a strong Lutheran Church in Latin America, ministering to those who come from other lands and, at the same time, bringing the message of the Gospel to others who do not have a living faith in Jesus Christ.

The chief method now being used is to form a multilingual Lutheran congregation with linguistic chapters. The outstanding example of this is the congregation in Caracas where there are German, Latvian and Hungarian chapters of the one congregation. Dr. Heinrich Falck, in reporting to the conference concerning this congregation, states: "We realize today that it was useful and beneficial to adopt the national Spanish language as the official language of our congregation, although we prefer at present to use the German

language in our conferences and meetings." He states further: "We realize today that it was useful and beneficial to allow for linguistic chapters in the respective mother tongues of the members but to place these chapters under the responsible leadership of one entire congregation. This represents more than merely a federation of chapters. In the event that one or more chapters should lose their mother tongue in coming generations, the generation would not lose its church. The entire congregation whose official language is Spanish guarantees the right and the room for a smooth and orderly development in this direction."

There was, however, considerable doubt in the minds of those present at the conference as to whether the emphasis on providing a ministry in the Spanish language was strong enough. In the same report concerning the Caracas congregation, it was said that there were occasional services in which the entire congregation worshipped at one time. On such occasions the sermon was preached in the German language, when to many it seems that the Spanish language would be the common tongue that ought to be used in that part of the world.

In the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Argentina the approach is somewhat different but the problems still remain. A quotation from this report is as follows: "Spanish is the official language of Argentina and of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Argentina. At 9 o'clock in Redeemer Church, Villa del Parque, services are conducted in Spanish. Immediately following this service the Germans gather for their service at 10:15. . . . at afternoon services the Latvians, Slovaks, and Hungarians worship in the same building. In spite of language barriers, it is amazing how well these different groups understand and get along with one another."

LWF Officers helpful

Bishop Hanns Lilje, president of the Lutheran World Federation, provided outstanding leadership at the conference and, I am quite certain, made a contribution that will produce real fruitage in the coming years. On the language question, he said that the Bible, the prayer book, preaching, etc., must be provided in the mother tongue for the old, but the youth must not be left, because of language, without understanding of what we teach. He also said that a Church is not a Church if she is not a missionary Church, and that no work of the Church has meaning that does not affect the congregations where the Gospel is preached.

Dr. Carl Lund-Quist, in his closing statement, expressed the opinion of most of those present when he indicated that in comparison with six years ago, and again in comparison with the conference three years ago at Curitiba, the churches in Latin America had reached a degree of understanding and mutual confidence for which all are grateful to God. All who had been present at the conference in Curitiba felt that tremendous progress has been made in meeting this difficult language question in Latin America.

Recent developments in Colombia

From reports presented at the conference it was clear that Protestants in Colombia were undergoing persecution. The following excerpts from one of the papers presented at the conference speak for themselves. "The Protestant Church of Colombia has been undergoing severe persecution for a period of about five years. Conditions before that time varied between toleration and fanatical opposition, depending often upon local conditions in the various sections of the country. About a year ago a new president took office after a bloodless revolution. The attitude of the new government gave promise of a liberal policy towards Protestant work, but it was discovered that a Concordat had been signed between the Vatican and the Government of Colombia that prohibited all active evangelistic work outside of designated places of worship and closed all non-

Catholic schools in the "mission territories". ('Mission territories' constitute about three-fourths of the entire country.)

"Since that time, various interpretations of the Concordat have been issued by the Minister of the Interior. Private interpretations of the many regulations have been made by mayors and military groups in various sections of the country, usually under the guidance of local priests or bishops, so that there has been continued violence against the Protestant Church in most sections of Colombia. The Lutheran Church established in Colombia by The Evangelical Lutheran Church and The United Evangelical Lutheran Church (two North-American churches) working jointly as a mission agency has also suffered from the persecution and the continued acts of hostility."

"All but one of our mission stations had to be abandoned during the period of persecution. Many of our churches and schools were destroyed—others are being used for other purposes. A majority of our church members have suffered heavy loss of property. Many of them were driven from their homes and are still living as refugees in one of the larger cities or in the plains. Some have lost their life for their faith. It is estimated that during this period the Protestant Church has increased in membership by 55 per cent. The spirit of our Lutheran Christians is excellent as a whole, but there are areas where they do not dare to hold services. There are some places where they do not even dare to recognize Protestant workers who come infrequently to their communities lest they suffer reprisal from local ecclesiastical or political authorities."

"The most recent violence suffered by our church took place in Parpa, a mountain community where the Lutheran congregation has had a firm foundation for some years, this congregation having erected the first Protestant chapel in the Province of Boyaca. This chapel was destroyed by bombs about three years ago when attacked by a mob of over one hundred men. The parsonage and the home of an active Christian living close to the chapel were also destroyed. Shortly after the new president came into power occasional services were held in the home of one of the members of the church, and a school was opened in his residence under a competent Colombian teacher. About three months ago this school was closed by the educational authorities of the district. Services were continued, but under constant threat of the priest in the neighboring town that the services would be prohibited."

"On June 27 special services were held in this temporary chapel, with special commemoration services in the ruins of their regular chapel building. About 240 persons attended the meetings. Six children were baptized, and many partook of the Lord's Supper. There was a fine spirit of consecration evident among the poeple and a firm determination on their part to rebuild the chapel and school, so full congregational work could be resumed with a resident evangelist or pastor."

"No opposition was noted on that day, but on the following Friday (July 2) the threat of the priest was carried out, the temporary chapel closed and Protestant services prohibited.

Colombian and missionary leaders were able to arrange for an audience with the commander-in-chief of the military forces of Colombia, as the mayor who closed the church was under military appointment. They were well received, and came away with the feeling that it is possible that intervention will be made on their behalf on the part of higher government authorities. To date we have had no further report, but the Lutherans of Parpa are continuing in faith to raise money for a new church building and to secure the necessary building materials."

"The above facts will illustrate the tension under which Protestants are continuing their work in Colombia. Constant prayer on their behalf is earnestly requested."

That the Lutheran Church in Latin America has a significant mission in Latin America was the firm conviction of those attending the conference.

Earl S. Erb

FROM LANDS AND CHURCHES

South America

Lutheranism and the Historic Forces of South America

Most South-American countries are pervaded by an atmosphere of optimistic expectation. Rich natural resources, well-favored climatic conditions, possibilities of development beyond measure, have created a vitality, a strong current of initiative which has swept many along in its wake. Sao Paulo is about to overtake Rio de Janeiro by rapid industrial development. Huge manufacturing plants arise, grandiose, widespread drainage systems have been started and here, as everywhere, vitality finds its expression in construction of the most daring architecture.

Granted that these countries differ considerably from Europe in their understanding of the state. The desire for strict political order is not generally far developed. It is precisely this lack which makes the area conducive to dictatorship. Public life is anything but calm; yet South-Americans do not regard this as an anxiety or a draw-back, but as an expression of vitality.

Behind the trellis of this outward phenomenon, a profound spiritual development is being consummated; the poets are its most powerful prophets. Latin-American literature of high rank has existed for a century and a half. Out of it there erupt ever new testimonies to this new spiritual strife which is a struggle for the spirit of Hispania. In the changed world-situation, the old colonial heritage has been recalled. Brazil, historically, was shaped by Portugal, all other Latin-American lands by Spain. The magnificent architectural monuments from the days of Pizarro and Cortez still extend that epoch into the present. But the blood of the Indios has been added, and the blood of countless immigrants who have carried on the heritage of the Conquistadores through hard and laborious work. And now the historic tremors of two wars have reached South America. She has to determine her place in world-history, and that is why a new spiritual consciousness is noticeable in all these contexts.

What is astonishing is the fact that a Lutheran Church exists against this background. When we met in South-America's most magnificent hotel, Quitandinha near Petropolis, amidst splendid scenery, for the Second Latin-American Conference of the Lutheran World Federation, we learned that there are about four hundred Lutheran pastors in this part of the world. The Lutheran Church is made up of old, usually German-speaking, synods which have been in the country for more than a hundred years and of very new Lutheran church structures, originating in the recent post-war immigration. Understandably, these are very unlike each other. The former must be concerned to hold together people united by a uniform Lutheran church-tradition, men who found in their church the basis of their common life and ethnic community. The latter must be concerned, above all, to help their members settle down in the new land as fast and as completely as possible and to maintain the Christian message in the spirit of the Reformation precisely in this process of adjustment to a new meaning in life. This demands, in the one case, careful cultivation of the German language which so easily degenerates in a foreign environment; in the other, it implies an open-minded penetration into the genius of South-America which bears the stamp of Spanish culture.

The discussions made it evident that the Lutheran Church must not fall into the error of being tied to a false alternative. She must have the spiritual strength to accommodate both points of view on an equal basis. The language in which a mother has taught her children to pray and which has grown close to a person through Bible, hymnal, and catechism, this language must not be

wantonly neglected. On the other hand, Spanish culture must be taken seriously; for children grow up, and an eighteen-year old student must be capable of speaking to his companions about his Lutheran faith in their tongue. Youth, in particular, has a sensitive ear to discern whether the Church and its faith are regarded as alien growth on South-American soil. In proportion with their numerical growth, the public significance and public responsibility of Lutherans will increase. But the Church will never be able to uphold either in accordance with her responsibility under the Gospel, unless she enters into the world of Iberian culture.

Her other great confrontation the Lutheran Church faces in Roman Catholicism. South America, especially Brazil, is counted among Rome's favorite children, for missionizing monks followed the Conquistadores, and South America looks back upon four hundred years of Christian history. How colorful, how manifold, how magnificent and how spiritual this history has become, is well-known. The marks, at any rate, are undeniable; in certain ways Catholic piety has deeply penetrated the soil. In the large church of the Madonna Guadalupe in Mexico I have seen stirring evidence of this deeply embedded Catholic piety which even the Mexican religious persecutions of the late twenties could not tarnish in the slightest. What more obvious than that the Catholic Church (and, above all, the clergy) in these countries, should regard herself as the self-evident guardian of the National Church. One has to be aware of this to explain the persecution of Protestants in Columbia and elsewhere. For the simple-minded faith of Catholic priests no other judgment of Protestants who proclaim a different faith is perhaps possible but that they should be intruders and agitators. They are strengthened in their view if they throw everything into one pot, as is almost general practice, and thus include under the one inexact collective term "Protestant" Lutherans as well as Pentecostals, Adventists, Bible Students (Jehova's witnesses), and other aggresive sects.

Almost everywhere on our South-American trip it proved possible to meet the papal nuncio or some other leading representative of local Catholicism. Thus there was a chance to call attention to two separate matters. In conversation with these men, who generally showed themselves to be highly cultured, competent, and discerning personalities, we were able to make it clear, on the one hand, that the Lutheran Church is not the same thing as one of those unrestrained sects; that, rather, she is an actual Church; that she shows Christian tact and consideration even where she must, for the sake of her professed faith, make an entirely different witness than the Catholic Church, and that she has no time for proselytizing so long as she tries to carry out her pastoral tasks. On the other hand, I made it quite clear on all occasions that much of the struggle against communism and against the suppression of liberty of conscience would be rendered totally unconvincing if there were no readiness, here in these countries themselves, to safeguard complete freedom of religious practice. On the whole, this was rightly understood. And there is sufficient cause to take such considerations seriously, since the best representatives of the Catholic Church are well aware that the supremacy of their church is no longer unchallenged and a foregone conclusion. Atheistic secularism rises like a ground frost in these countries, too, and the talk about expelling Christian Western culture has achieved unexpected seriousness even in this remote part of the world.

If you keep in sight the tremendous possibilities of the South American continent and the profound spiritual ferment building up within it, then the task of the Lutheran Church may appear well-nigh unrealizably great, for external resources in men and money are very limited. At times, there is a truly agonizing disparity. That is why the challenge to create the greatest possible degree of organizational collaboration which faces the Lutheran Church in South America, has become an absolutely vital necessity.

Planned and disciplined co-operation is indispensable in the face of the limited material possibilities. This is true in two areas above all: the training of a young generation of theologians and the production of useful Lutheran literature. The seminary at Sao Leopoldo, now under Dr. Dohns' direction, has rendered distinguished services. In addition, the formation of a theological seminary in Buenos Aires, to be supported by all the Lutheran churches, has now been agreed upon. Here, future Lutheran pastors will be trained for the encounter with the world of Spanish culture, without regard to the organizational boundaries of the Lutheran Church.

The second Latin-American Conference of the Lutheran World Federation has proved once again how good and pleasant it is if brothers not only dwell together in unity but also, across all distances, project their plans together in unity. And if this happens with such warm, brotherly sincerity and on such a high level as was the case at the Petropolis Conference, then each can directly experience the blessing which such collaboration may contain. Once again, I should like to greet all the brethren who were assembled at this meeting and to thank them for making possible such a fine, open-minded, and fruitful encounter.

The outlines which appear in a condensed review find their realization in the daily work of congregations and synods. The multiformity of historical guidance also plays a role here. There is material for a fascinating saga in the German settlers' initial efforts in Brazil and their experiences in the course of over a century.

We have reason to be grateful that from the beginning of this story, far-seeing men understood the Church's tasks, interpreted them, and helped the German-speaking synods in Brazil to achieve quickly a workable organizational structure—generally with effective help from the German homeland. And the church institutions established on the "Spiegelberg" near Sao Leopoldo have produced abundant and far-reaching results for the church-life which they serve and tend. The growth of German Evangelical work in Argentina and Chile has run a different course—and yet there is a fundamental similarity. Here, too, productive organization of church work occurred relatively early. At this point I should like to insert a word of gratitude to those who have fulfilled a task so completely different from anything known in the home church, accomplished it as faithful servants of the Gospel and of their congregations in those far-off regions with their tremendous distances. But even that part of the world has finally felt the effects of current developments: There are some places where German immigrants pour in by thousands and tens of thousand, setting gigantic tasks for the Church. The nationality problem has changed fundamentally. Modern communications have rapidly created one of the world's most up-to-date airline systems in South America. At focal points this barely leaves any obstacles in the way of a uniform, nation-wide church. In Lima (Peru) we dedicated a very beautiful Lutheran church which, if everything turns out well, may help unite Germans with Scandinavians, Dutch, Swiss and other nationalities into one large Lutheran Church.

It is not yet possible to predict with certainty all the details of future development. One can merely try to ponder most carefully over all the possibilities and plan accordingly. Here, the services of the Lutheran World Federation could be of particular significance. It might help develop something like a spiritual strategy in the common consideration of the task and the joint preparations, it might help to preserve us from overlooking important duties or from failing to exploit other material possibilities. That, at any rate, is the purpose of all who participate; in a special sense it is the guiding principle of all work done in the Lutheran World Federation Committee on Latin-America. For the aim of the Lutheran Church, also in South America, is not confessional propaganda but service to the congregations who cling to the Gospel as the Reformation taught us to understand it. That a special hour has

struck for this message of the Reformation in South America—just as in other ends of the earth—of that there is no doubt. Hanns Lilje

Finland

A Visit to Finland

A view characteristic of Finland's historical situation meets the traveller approaching the Finnish capital by sea, as soon as the ship passes the old fortified island of Suemenlinna. On the western side rises the shining cupola of the Evangelical Cathedral (Suurkirko—Great Church) built of white Finnish marble in the classical style by Engel, a pupil of Schinkel; on the east side the dark red stone of the Russian Orthodox Uspenski Cathedral rises at an equal height.

However, the Greek Orthodox Church no longer retains any significance in Finnish religious life, especially since the well-known monastery of Valamo in Lake Ladoga, once the shrine for many Orthodox pilgrims, fell to the Soviet Union under the last treaty, together with a large section of Orthodox Karelia. The two hundred monks, who once fled with their ikons and bells before the Soviet troops, were resettled on a former country seat between Kuopio and Joensuu, in central Finland. Most of them now rest in the humble churchyard among the birches, near Uusi-Valamo (New Valamo). About seventy monks still live on the former estate. Twenty of them are over 80, the youngest, a Deacon, about 45; there is but one novice at Uusi-Valamo. The monastery is doomed to extinction. Officially, abbot and monks who, with one exception, speak only Russian, have placed themselves under the Patriarchate of Moscow. The bishop of the Finnish Orthodox congregations, whose see is in Kuopio, has never been to Uusi-Valamo. A press report recently charged political ties between the monastery and Moscow. However, if you have visited the monastery, painstakingly maintained by these old men in poverty and solitude deep in the forest, you will not attach any great importance to this report.

Finland's tense situation between West and East is brought much closer to hand in other ways. Not only is the Russian border in east Finland pushed far into the west, into the very neighborhood of Imatra; west of Helsinki, also, the Soviets have created a mysterious military installation by renting the Parkkala sector for 99 years. From here, the trains of the Russian garrison maintain direct connection with Leningrad, while the Finnish trains on the Turku-Helsinki line may cross this sector only with sealed coaches and closed windows. In the very center of Helsinki, by the Park where the other diplomatic missions are also established, a Soviet Embassy has arisen whose pompous, colossal dimensions are out of all true proportion to its diplomatic function in such a relatively small country. The building must rather be regarded as the expression of political pretensions. These pretensions are, indeed, respected by the realistic Finns, as far as their sovereignty and continuity as a nation — as well as their cool and obstinate neutrality which does not allow any comparison with the countries behind the "iron curtain" — will permit. The curiosity of separate trade delegations maintained by both the German Federal Republic and the DDR (German Democratic Republic = Russian Zone) is characteristic of this attitude.

Critical observers of the work of the Evangelical Academy at Tutzing, center of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Bavaria, may have thought it extravagant, at first sight, that this institution should send several of its faculty to Finland of all places, from Whitsuntide until Midsummer. There they organized a conference for the local German congregation (most of whose members are Finnish nationals) at the Parochial Institute of the Church of Finland, the Luther-Opisto at Järvenpää. In addition, they lectured at another conference, set up jointly with Finland's Christian Cultural Association for Finnish educators.

The small group was well aware that they were travelling under an assign-

ment whose scope and significance could not be gauged except on the spot. The conditions for the lecture and study tour were quite clear. The plan had not simply materialized from thin air—at least not for anyone who was aware of some of the spiritual and ecclesiastical ties between the land of the Reformation and Finland. Since the outcome of the Second World War left Finland politically more exposed than before, and since Finland is destined to be a cornerstone of the Christian West just because of this exposed position, intensive collaboration with the West ought to be significant, above all if it is grounded in our common Evangelical-Lutheran Church. Faculty members of the Evangelical Academy at Tutzing, had come to Finland in the spirit of such collaboration. Nevertheless, the political background could not be ignored, especially since Finnish Protestantism—and even more, Finnish Pietism—has ever been organically linked with patriotism.

Since the Second World War, however, considerable changes have taken place in this. Traditional patriotism, up till then still nourished by the overwhelming experience of national awakening in the 19th century, has changed in the face of the world's political development which gives to small nations an ever-diminishing chance of existence. It is true that the principle of Finland's statesman, Snellman, ever to remain true to your own character as a people, has lost none of its validity. But the changed situation calls for a new form of patriotic activity, to practice patriotism as service to your neighbor, to your fellow-men. This was the definition given in a critical analysis of patriotism in contemporary Finland during the meeting on educational questions at Järvenpää. Certain changes have also taken place in religious life. Of course, Pietism with its revival movements within the Church continues to play an important role; and a large proportion of the clergy have their roots in this Pietism. But new methods are required of the Church by the sociological and psychological problems which have arisen due to high-pressure industrialization and urbanization of the country necessitated by the payment of reparations. Pietism with its distrust of the world of the intellectuals can appreciate these methods only with great difficulty. Nonetheless, the attempt is being made in the Luther-Opisto in Järvenpää, to circumscribe the problems of the modern world and to analyse them theologically, just as in the Evangelical Academies, though under different cirumstances. Here is a center for Evangelical intellectual life that promises to render pioneer service to the Finnish Church.

The Parochial Institute Luther-Opisto is situated about 25 miles north of Helsinki in a district traditional in Finnish culture. It was built after the war, with the help of American Protestants, on a rural estate which used to belong to Setälä, famous scholar of language and myth, opposite the home of composer Jan Sibelius. (Every year Helsinki holds a Sibelius Festival, a musical event of the first order, which the aged Master himself never attends; no invitation can lure him away from his secluded house in the woods.) Painters like Eero Järnefeldt and Pekka Halonen had their studios on Lake Tuusula; the remains of Finland's greatest poet, Aleksis Kivi, rest in the graveyard by the 18th century wooden church at one end of the lake. After the conference-congregation from Luther-Opisto had worshipped in Tuusula Church, they travelled several kilometers to the tiny cottage where the poet died at an early age, in great poverty and deep despair. His main work, *The Seven Brothers*, a novel, not only ranks as a classic of folk-writing, but is part of world-literature. Moreover, it is one of the most magnificent monuments to the Protestant spirit—without ever expressing anything theological or confessional in so many words. But the theme is a cardinal Christian topic: the education of natural man through the Word of God.

That, of course, is the very task of the Parochial Institute of the Lutheran Church of Finland: above all it must train and aid parish workers, cantors,

catechists, and other lay-workers in the service of the church, in courses which last several weeks or even months. To the extent that the Institute provides an education similar to that of the „Volkshochschulen" (adult education institutes) in various subjects such as history, church history, theology, music, education, languages, it falls under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education. During the stay of the German group, a course for cantors was being completed. At the same time, the "Cantores Minores" arrived. This is a boys' choir which was to receive meticulous training as the Cathedral Choir of the "Great Church" in Helsinki, under the guidance of a former director of the Vienna "Sängerknaben". A group of Scandinavian Seamen's Pastors also came for several days to hold a conference at the Luther-Opisto.

As a spiritual institution the Luther-Opisto comes under the jurisdiction of Bishops Eino Sormunen (Kuopio) and Simojoki (Mikkeli). The former has gained a reputation as a scholar in many fields, the latter is a young and very active leader of the Church. From the plans for the future, as presented by Rector Pastor Siirala, Executive Director of the Luther-Opisto, it appears that the tremendous opportunity which the Finnish Church has created in its Parochial Institute is being fulfilled in a very modern Christian spirit.

Numerous "Volkshochschulen" scattered widely over the country, fulfil a similar function on a smaller scale. This author had the opportunity of visiting a remote Karelian "Volkshochschule" which had invited him to give an address on "the Spirit of the Baptist" at their celebration of St. John's Day. The importance of such small centers should not be underestimated. The spiritual and political power of self-preservation is largely nurtured by such places. The Finns have ever been a people of readers. Their romantic patriotism and lyrical love of home—which found its perfect expression in the music of Jan Sibelius—has found a healthy balance in devout biblical realism. This devout realism is characterized in many of the anecdotes which mostly derive from the region of Savo whose population is known for its devious, sometimes ironical ways of thought. Thus they tell about an old peasant woman who made the following comment on God's methods of conversion: it is strange how God changes His methods of conversion. Formerly, so she said, He kept fish under water; now He places them on stones, in the sun; quite possibly some might dry up. And another old woman, it is reported, at a country fair placed herself, grinning, in front of an exceedingly vain "Sunday horseman", one of the literati, bedecked with numerous medals. When he asked her angrily at what she was laughing, she replied deliberately: I am laughing about my own comparative insignificance.

However, our own experiences may prove more convincing than such oft-told anecdotes, no matter how pale they may look by comparison. During the journey of the Tutzing group there was no lack of various little encounters which memory has retained as examples of lives lived in natural Christian piety. Here one should give first place to the much-lauded hospitality extended, in the widest sense of the word, to the foreign visitors wherever they went and not only by those who had invited them to Finland; by the man, for instance, who carried your suitcase as a matter of course in a natural way unthinkable elsewhere. The tip that was unwittingly handed him he returned, nobly avoiding any embarrassment, in the form of little gifts, tokens of hospitality. Or think of the train conductor who not only led the foreign guests to the station's lunch counter but posted himself there in order that they might have their refreshments without fear of missing the train. Is it that each person retains his individuality and his assigned rank in natural surroundings which are overpowering by their vastness and monotony? This hospitality is the expression of natural Christian humanity; it respects man, and it trusts him. Only where the individual still enjoys undiminished respect, where the refugee, the distressed, the "beggar", is literally

the "honored beggar" (as Runeberg's epic "The Moose-Hunters" puts it), there is still "a people" and, as a result, a natural, relaxed, patriotism. The unadulterated substance of this natural Christianity is surely the true source of the astonishing calm and self-possession which the Finns as a nation retain despite their extraordinarily exposed political situation, and which prevented all resentment among them about the defeat in the last war. They have not proclaimed a "Finnish Miracle", even though it is close to the miraculous that Finland did not suffer the fate of the countries behind the iron curtain in 1945.

It is a country where life is based on the spirit of Luther's "A Mighty Fortress is our God". This chorale has a purer sound in completely Evangelical Finland which knows no confessional contrasts or diaspora problems; that is, it does have a thoroughly theological sound, but without any overtones of confessional history. At most, there is a note of gratitude towards the country in which Martin Luther's Reformation was born, when this chorale is sung in Finland on an occasion such as the closing of the joint Finnish-German conference. The members of the Evangelical Academy at Tutzing had gone to Finland primarily as members of the great Evangelical Congregation; only incidentally were they representatives of the people in whose language the message of the Reformation was first proclaimed.

For the Congregation of Christ the language problem has a different relevance than for the nations. Even though there was hardly any difficulty of communication at the joint conference at Luther-Opisto (only the Finnish talks had to be translated), situations continuously occurred in which the difference of language was—one might say, painfully, yet positively, experienced. Perhaps we needed just such an encounter to turn the mystery of Pentecost into a that much deeper experience. It was in church, during the singing of the Finnish chorales and the common Prayer of our Lord, that the Finnish language revealed itself most beautifully to the foreign guests in all its melodious majesty. They learned to love this alien tongue as one which can harbor the word of God; one which can let itself be permeated by it as it prays for the Holy Spirit who, while not destroying our languages, does transform and sanctify them.

Heinz Flügel

Germany

The Revision of the Luther Bible: Tasks and Achievements

In recent months, numerous articles have appeared in theological and church magazines and even in the daily press on the work of the New Testament Commission for the Revision of the Luther Bible, some of which convey a rather inadequate impression of the work of this Commission. The following statements are made in order to give some necessary clarification on the subject:

It is probably known that a commission has been at work on the revision of the Luther text of the German Bible since 1928 under the auspices of the Bible Societies and in connection with the then Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchenausschuss. The rules of its work were carefully outlined in the eight principles for the revision of the Bible in 1928. In 1938 the commission edited a prooftext of the revised New Testament. The manifold public criticism, as it was expressed over against this "proof copy" was used by the president of the commission, Vicepresident D. Burghart, who in the end was also its only surviving member, when a manuscript print was published in 1949 in a very small edition.

In 1952 the Council of the Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland (EKD), in consultation with the Bible Societies, resumed the work after an interval of some years and appointed a commission of six members under the chairmanship of Professor D. Strathmann, Erlangen, with the task to continue the work of Bible revision along earlier lines and to conclude the work by first issuing the New Testament. To continue

and to conclude meant of course that the new commission also would work along the 1928 principles. According to these principles one should work for a Luther Bible as the living expression of the Gospel of the Reformation in the German language and in this way it would become a unifying bond of all German speaking Evangelical Christians. Obvious errors were to be eliminated; old-fashioned words and phrases no longer understood, were to be replaced. The many minor variant readings in Nestle's edition of the Greek text which was generally the basis of the revision, should be omitted. Particular emphasis was laid on the rhythm and harmony of the language; great care was to be applied to reference passages.

The Commission of the Council of the EKD held three working conferences in 1952 and 1953. Unfortunately, considerable personal and material difficulties arose among its members which could not be settled by a church conference in the spring of 1953. While one member of the Commission, Oberkirchenrat Dr. Schanze, was most concerned with preserving the sound of Luther's language according to the principle also used in the recently published Lectionary of the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany, the chairman of the Commission urged a complete adjustment to the Nestle text and considerable modernization of the language. At times the Commission was in danger of forgetting the difference between a revision of the Luther text and an entirely new translation.

At the third working conference, in autumn 1953, the majority of the Commission turned down the proposition of the chairman, to submit the text of the Gospel according to St. Mark in the present state of its revision to the church public. Instead of this it was proposed to proceed with the continuation of the work through the formation of smaller sub-committees. When Professor Strathmann published without any previous notice to the supervising body, the Council of the EKD, a memorandum entitled "Krisis", a false impression was created that an adequate revision of the Luther Bible was in danger. As the Council became convinced that a continuation of the work of the Commission under its former chairman would not lead to success and also got the impression from the sample of the St. Mark's Gospel text whose publication Professor D. Strathmann had planned that this revision of the New Testament was not in all points in accordance with the principles of 1928, it dissolved the Commission and, after consultation with the Bible Societies, appointed a new Commission among whose eight members four had already been members of the previous one, i. e. all with the exception of Professor D. Strathmann and Oberkirchenrat Dr. Schanze. The members of the new Commission are: Oberkirchenrat Professor Dr. *Beckmann*, Prelate Dr. *Eichele*, Pastor *Gess*, Dr. Willy *Kramp*, Kirchenrat *von Staa*, Professor D. Otto *Weber*, Pastor *Zarneckow*, Vice-President *Zimmermann*. The President of the Council, Bishop D. Dr. Dibelius became chairman of the Commission.

The new Commission has worked in several sessions under its new chairman with the greatest unanimity. The single books of the New Testament were prepared by sub-committees with two members always working together and were finally completed at the plenary sessions of the Commission. A number of books of the New Testament have already reached the final stage of revision. The Commission hopes to finish its work by the end of 1954. The result will be submitted to the church public immediately afterwards.

It is in the interest of a successful continuation of this great task that we make a warm and instant appeal not to disturb the work of the Commission and to wait with all criticism until the result is published. The members of the Commission have been pledged not to publish any papers on the status of the project as long as this work is still going on. They are therefore unable to reject incorrect statements and unjustified criticism. It can, however, be stated that it is untrue to say that the new Commission is operating under completely different principles and that its

work has taken a critical turn and that the result will be nothing but artificial restoration of an archaic Luther text. Anybody who has intimate knowledge of the work of the new Commission can only express joy at the unanimity of its members and the serious responsibility with which the Commission tries to make the necessary alterations in accordance with modern biblical scholarship and linguistic requirements in such a way as to preserve the Luther Bible as the bond of unity for all German-speaking Evangelical Christians. Heinz Brunotte

Memorandum

Of the Ecumenical Commission of the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany on the relation of Church Fellowship and Communion dated September 18, 1954

Following the discussions of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order in Lund 1952, the church authorites of the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church in Germany (United Church) ordered the Ecumenical Commission of the United Church to follow up the issue of church fellowship (Kirchengemeinschaft) and communion (Abendmahlsgemeinschaft)[1]. Thus the commission had to take a stand on the Report prepared by Section 5 in Lund and the questions it addresses to the participating churches. The Ecumenical Commission, during four working sessions, reached the following conclusion:

1. Church Fellowship and Communion both depend upon and require one another.

Detailed exegetical efforts showed that this thesis is clearly called for by all the passages of the New Testament concerned with this problem area, especially by Acts 2:42;46 and 1 Cor. 10:16,f. It is confirmed by the theology and practice of the Early Church. It is fundamental for the attitude of the Lutheran reformers. On it is based the practice of closed communion in the confessional writings and church regulations of the Lutheran Church.

2. However, the Lutheran Church knows exceptions to this rule, as do the Early Church, the Roman, the Orthodox and the Anglican, e. g. *in articulo mortis*. The question has been put to us by Lund (Section 5, Part C, Para. 3) whether the exception could not become the rule. We must answer this question in the negative. The Church lives within the Final Days, i. e. she still lives in history where confession is demanded of her. Therefore she must set up regulations valid in history which must be obeyed in the obedience of faith. The fact that at the same time she derives her life from the End; that this border situation ever again demands concrete decisions (such as *in articulo mortis*, in the isolation of individual Christians, in concentration camps, etc.) and, beyond that, shows up the temporary nature and insufficiency of all orders, this fact does not free the Church from the duty to watch over the validity of the present orders.

3. We have also followed up the further question put in the Lund Report, why the communion of the Lord's Table should not be granted to all who have been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ and thus become members of His body. Was not jointly celebrated communion "the God-given sacrament of unity", the "true medicine for our divisions"?

For us, too, the sacrament of baptism constitutes an indispensable condition of all church fellowship as well as a call for its realization. For us, too, there is a close connection between baptism and the Lord's Supper.

---

[1]) These terms do not fully reproduce all the connotations of "Kirchengemeinschaft" and "Abendmahlsgemeinschaft". To some extent, these are both defined in the text under section 4. "Church fellowship" ought really to be rendered as "communion"—if it were not for the fact that this word is linked with the Sacrament. Where "communion" IS used, it refers to the Sacrament of the Lord's Table. "Common communion" is used to emphasize the shared Sacrament without using "intercommunion" or any of the other terms which have been given a specific and limited meaning in the Lund Report and elsewhere.

But, first of all one must distinguish between the validity of the sacraments and the proper ordering of their use. We are asked to see to the right order, primarily. The validity of the sacraments is, finally, the responsibility of God's judicial majesty and, in view of the objections of some churches (Baptists, Orthodox, and others), ought to be reconsidered also in relationship to baptism.

Secondly, moreover, there is a characteristic difference between the two sacraments. Baptism is appointed by Christ for the world's salvation; Holy Communion is given by Him to the Congregation for its strengthening and conservation. Thus, partaking of the Supper presupposes church fellowship, and at the same time places one right into it. The Supper is therefore more directly related to concrete church fellowship than baptism.

4. We are aware that the concept of "church fellowship" is used in various senses and is therefore ambiguous. By "church fellowship" we understand that union among the members of the body of Christ, to which the New Testament testifies and which is created by their union with Christ. It does and must find its concrete expression in this world through parishes, dioceses, and churches (Landeskirchen), etc.

By "communion" we understand the union created through participation in Christ's body and blood among those who celebrate the Lord's Supper.

"Church fellowship" comprises not only the one baptism, upon which it is founded and the common communion in which it is realized, but necessarily also a common proclamation of the same Gospel and a common confession of faith. That is why church fellowship and full communion cannot be based solely on the acknowledgment of the one baptism.

There are, however, some members of the Commission who differentiate between common communion and membership in the same denomination (Konfessionskirche). They believe they may hold the former with all whom they must regard as members of the body of Christ according to the *judicium caritatis*, and who in that sense are members of the church, (Cf. below, section 7 b, para. 2).

5. With reference to a conference communion which underwent exhaustive consideration at Lund, we want to reaffirm that the Sacrament of the Holy Supper has its proper place here on earth within the individual congregation, organized according to its creed within a church. To this, ecumenical conferences should also adhere, and the invitation to celebrate Holy Communion should therefore come only from such individual congregations. The orders of the church to which such a congregation belongs should be the criterion for admittance to these celebrations of the Lord's Supper.

The Commission should undertake a still more searching examination of the suggestions for the regulation of communion services at conferences, mentioned in the Lund report.

6. Regarding the internal situation of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD), the Commission is of the unanimous opinion that the confusion about communion, and the decay of long-established ecclesiastical orders are due to an uncertainty within our own ranks about the doctrine of the Church and the Holy Communion.

Clarification must therefore begin with ourselves. In view of that, the following must be considered with regard to Holy Communion:

a) The biblical foundation of the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacrament of Holy Communion should be freshly set forth in juxtaposition with modern scriptural research.

b) From there one should strive after a uniform basic understanding within the Lutheran Church of the Reformation doctrine of Holy Communion.

c) Responsible discussions with the Reformed and the Unionists[2] must establish whether any convergence

[2]) Those of the Reformed and United (Unierte) Churches within the EKD.

of views has in fact taken place, as is frequently claimed.

d) We must determine systematically and theologically, to what extent the contemporary changes of sociological and ecclesiastical structures demand an alteration in traditional practice concerning the Lord's Supper.

Only when clarification of these questions is undertaken in earnest, can proper discipline be practised in doctrine and Communion.

7. The Commission was given the direct task of dealing with the problem of common communion. From the beginning it should be stated axiomatically that the differentiations made at Lund between "intercommunion" and "open communion" do not establish a choice of alternatives; rather, each of them corresponds to a particular conception of the Church and the Sacrament.

The Commission considered three possible courses of practical action for the Lutheran Churches (Landeskirchen):

a) to retain the practice described in the Grundordnung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (Basic Law of the Evangelical Church in Germany), Article IV, 4. In Lund's terminology this usage might be described as "communion by economy or dispensation" (or as "limited open communion" i. e. "the admission of members of other Churches ... in case of emergency or in other special circumstances".)

It means that Lutheran churches admit to Communion Christians of another confession valid within the Evangelical Church in Germany "wherever pastoral responsibility or conditions in the parish make the admission mandatory".

The Commission regards such usage strictly as an emergency solution.

b) The practical emergency is to be solved in that Lutheran Churches will celebrate open communion on principle. In Lund's terminology, this would be "unilateral open communion". It would mean that members of other churches would be admitted to Holy Communion at Lutheran altars on principle. Here, further particulars could or ought to determine which churches should be affected by this; whether it should include Methodists, Anglicans and other member churches of the World Council of Churches, or only Christians belonging to the Evangelical Church in Germany. The break-up of communion discipline and of the practice of preliminary registration for Communion, as well as the change in structure indicated above, have suggested such an adjustment.

In Sweden, too, it was the suspension of the obligation to register in advance that led to the occasional practice of open communion.

The Ecumenical Commission cannot approve this solution, if it implies forgoing ecclesiastical, theological clarification. Its theological justification was, indeed, attempted in the Commission (e. g. by K. D. Schmidt and Th. Schlatter), but others regarded this as insufficient to recommend the practice.

c) A third chance to extricate ourselves from the present emergency situation in the EKD exists if the Lutheran Churches were to negotiate Church by Church following the example of early-church practice, to determine whether the conditions for full church communion exist.

The Commission is of the opinion that the ecclesiastically legitimate way to overcome the current emergency would be for the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany to take the initiative towards such doctrinal discussions, and in this manner further clarify her internal situation at the same time.

Concerning this, the Commission thought it important that, according to the New Testament, the only eschatological alternative is between Church

and heresy, but that there are a whole series of denominations with whom we are not in full *consensus de doctrina* today, and therefore not in church fellowship, and yet we cannot regard them as "nonchurch" according to the New Testament. To part of the Commission this appears to present an opening for possible limited church fellowship and communion.

Any negotiations intending to establish limited church-fellowship and communion to begin with, would have to determine whether the following conditions prevail:

i) that the Sacrament of Holy Baptism is uniformly taught and administered.

ii) that the reality of the Sacrament of the Altar is preserved in the sense that the body and blood of Christ actually are distributed under the bread and wine.

iii) that the soteriological (i. e. pertaining to the doctrine of redemption) center of the preaching of the Gospel *(solus Christus, sola scriptura, sola gratia* and *sola fides)* is retained unfalsified.

iv) that a certain measure of common perception of faith can be expressed with regard to the Holy Communion.

Several members of the Commision feel that they must maintain over against this that intercommunion is not possible for the Evangelical-Lutheran Church in the way in which it is arranged elsewhere in ecumenism among churches which do not know themselves in full fellowship. Only a genuine *consensus de doctrina evangelii et de administratione sacramentorum* would provide true unity of the Church, making possible the practice of church fellowship and communion. The doctrinal negotiations referred to in c) above would not be served by achieving an intentionally limited intercommunion, arranged as a temporary expedient, for they should aim at a true consensus of doctrine and thus at complete church fellowship.

8. In all its discussions, the Commission was of the unanimous opinion that it is necessary time and again to probe the rigid territorial principle reciprocally practiced within the Evangelical Church in Germany, since it stands in the way of any real communion discipline. There was equal unanimity about the necessity continually to summon the member churches, their pastors and congregations to administer the Sacrament of Holy Communion with renewed gratitude, love, and loyalty in order that it might attain the place assigned to it by the Lord of the Church, both in parish life and in the hearts of the members of the congregation.

Review of the Activities of the Synod of the United Church

The General Synod of the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany, in concert with the Conference of Bishops, addressed the following communication to the congregations on October 15, 1954:

The First General Synod of the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany, elected 1948, concludes its period of office with its last session, held in Braunschweig (Brunswick) in October 1954. A new General Synod to serve the next six years will be formed in 1955. The outgoing Synod sends greetings to the incoming one and to the congregations of the Lutheran member churches.

The United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany is a union of Lutheran Landeskirchen, from the East and the West of our fatherland, into one Lutheran church. We want to overcome the boundary-lines of our separate churches, want to attain to united action and a unified structure for the Lutheran Church in Germany. The Evangelical-Lutheran confession has provided the foundation for our union during all deliberations of the General Synod.

The following are the results of these deliberations:

The Evangelical Church-Hymnal has been approved as the hymnal of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of

Germany; so has the lectionary of scripture reading for divine service;

The work on the Collection of Orders and Services (Agendenwerk) of the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany has been advanced to the point where the orders of service comprising volumes I and IV have been determined, as well as the orders for baptism and confirmation;

The individual sections of an Order of Life (Lebensordnung) for Evangelical-Lutheran churches and congregations have been worked out and have been committed to the member churches as guiding principles;

A uniform text for Dr. Martin Luther's *Small Catechism* has been laid down;

In addition, statements have been made on some important issues in Lutheran Doctrine, e. g. on the doctrine of Holy Baptism, on the understanding of confirmation, on matrimony and the marriage rite, and on Church discipline.

It will require much trouble and toil on the part of member churches and governing bodies before the resolutions passed by the first General Synod are carried out and made fruitful. We should like to ask the congregations, above all, to familiarize themselves with the new hymnal and the new Order of Service. Whoever approves our path in the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany will be prepared to sacrifice many a cherished custom for the sake of the larger whole.

Let us, in the communion of our faith, grow joyful and certain of the Gospel and praise and glorify our Lord Jesus Christ in the services of the congregation, and in daily life.

POST-EVANSTON GLEANINGS

The time of reports from Evanston is past; it ended with several interesting attempts at some sort of provisional evaluation. The tentative nature of such accounting is stressed again and again. Almost all the authors promise to return in greater detail to this or that question in the near future. If only a fraction of them keep their word, then Evanston will have started a fertile theological and ecclesiastical conversation. With all the caution practiced by the commentators up to now, two effects of this conversation may nonetheless be predicted this early: 1) it will make the relevance of religious dogmatic decisions increasingly intelligible to men within and outside the Church; 2) more than hitherto it will become a conversation of the total Church, in which Christians must participate, no matter whether they are connected with the World Council of Churches organizationally or not.

Granted, the first of these effects was probably intended even in the choice of the General Theme; but this did not lead to a decisive eruption, to a confrontation (through the Church) of the world by Christ as the hope, in judgment and grace. No one, surely, would claim to see such an eruption in the all-too-carefully-weighed final Message. Neither would anyone want to agree with the German professor of theology who was not at Evanston and who called this message "a triumph of banality." The fact that the churches of the 20th century are attempting to speak jointly, once again, at a Council is by no means banal, it is, on the contrary, extremely exciting. Every half-way informed person knows that there have been ineffectual Church Councils; but every Christian who is seriously concerned about his Church knows also that each generation in turn faces the decisive challenge whether it will dare attempt a determination of truth and error in the doctrines and opinions current among it. Wherever this is ventured, the whole Church is involved, de facto if not de jure. This very fact is illustrated in the reporting of Evanston by the attitude of the two great communities which were not there represented, the Roman Church and the Moscow Patriarchate of the Greek-Orthodox Church.

"The wide variety of positions represented in the ecumenical movement is remarkable for its composition as well as for the inherent possibilities of incorporating ecclesiastically those participants in the movement who seek the unity of the Promises and of the fullness of the Christian Church." Thus writes the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate in an article "Between Fear and Hope," and continues: "That is why we Orthodox must not only observe the development of the ecumenical Church, but must also give our Church's answer to her concerns, thoughts, and decisions." The Orthodox churches who participated in the General Assembly have indeed done this; if the statement means what it says, this could come about in any seriousness only if the Moscow Patriarchate and the dioceses and parishes under its jurisdiction were to participate directly in the conversation of the Church. On the other hand, this would remind the ecumenical movement that Christians in the Communist countries are concerned about a "church's answer," and not, primarily, about the question of political co-existence. This, too, had best be taken to mean simply what it says.

At any rate, the churches not belonging to the ecumenical movement followed especially the negative decisions of the Evanston conference with particular attention. There was no one truly common communion, there was no united adoption of the Report on the Main Theme, and the representatives of the Orthodox Church added their own, divergent report to the report of Section I (Faith and Order), including a special justification of this divergence. There was awareness of the weight of the decisions in question. The report of Section III (Social Questions) was accepted, "many a delegate hardly knowing what he did, as he voted for the acceptance of the report," as Hans Hermann Walz asserts in the Zeitwende/Neue Furche. In that connection, Christianity and Crisis remarks that Sections III, IV

(International Relations), and V (Intergroup Relations) had "the advantage of dealing with central Christian attitudes toward a fairly definite field of human problems, for which churches and Christians do not, as such, take operative or over-all responsibility." It was a different story wherever the issue of theological truth was at stake. There, decisions were made with the greatest care and awareness of high responsibility.

There may be doubts whether these decisions were always objectively correct. With reference to the question of Communion, the Catholic Herderkorrespondenz considers them "wise and correct" while Eivind Berggrav in Kirke og Kultur has already announced a detailed essay in which he is going to prove the invitation to Communion which the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church directed only at those who share the Lutheran understanding of the Lord's Supper, to be neither Lutheran nor biblical. The seriousness and responsibility with which both sides reached their decision in this matter no doubt heightened, rather than damaged, the ecumenical dignity of this Council. It did not at all become apparent that, as Heinz Kloppenburg seems to feel (in Junge Kirche) an "Orthodox block" and some suspicious Lutherans ever and again spoil the pleasant ecumenical harmony. On the contrary, it became clear that the churches who raise the question of truth do so in the name of all Christianity and that Christianity listens. Père Dumont, a Catholic who was present at Evanston, though not "officially," writes in Vers l' Unité Chrétienne: "Very often we might have said that our Orthodox brethren defend the very theological and ecclesiological principles (excepting the authority of the Pope, naturally) which we ourselves should have to uphold in this community were we members."

The difficulty is that, within the framework of the current parliamentary machinery, such an attitude can easily be interpreted as Confessionalism, as a "party line" as The Christian Century calls it. (Yet this machinery is currently the only possible one at the disposal of such an assembly.) But, then, the difficulty could just as easily lie in the whole apparatus as in the attitude outlined above. At any rate, Evanston clearly showed the limits of parliamentarianism in the Church. Truths of faith cannot be established by majority resolutions. In several important decisions the World Council of Churches accepted this thesis. How the negation which it implies will be tolerated and in what manner this negation can be applied positively will be of considerable importance for the future.

In a spirited attempt to draw a final balance, The Christian Century hinted, at least, at the solution in which it believes. This is: Less theology and "more common tasks," in which the common tasks apparently should be understood in terms of "works of mercy and help." Such a solution, however, would have to answer the question whether it does not, rather, constitute an evasion of the questions which are decisive for the ecumenical community. The previously quoted Moscow Journal thinks: "Consciousness of danger to society combines with hope for the union of all Christian churches in the ecumenical community: worries about society join eschatological expectations." We shall not be able simply to push aside this argument in which Marxist critique of society and Orthodox religion strangely agree. From it we ought to learn, at least, that the Charismata (spiritual gifts of grace) which are peculiar to the Church as the body of Christ according to 1. Cor. 12, must not be understood in the sense of an "either-or."

Thus what will matter is precisely a right synthesis instead of an "either-or," the greatest discipline and restraint in the polemics against those who, apparently, "won't join," and success in learning, as a Church, to wait, as Hanns Lilje puts it in his report regarding the final Message, to wait for "what such a conference cannot achieve by a majority vote" but what "the Spirit of God Himself may grant in rare hours of the Church's history."

Schedule of Meetings

of the Lutheran World Federation

1955

Commission on Theology	February 3—6, Hamburg, Germany
Commission on World Service	February 9—11, Hannover, Germany
Executive Committee Meeting	February 14—19, Vienna, Austria
Commission on Education	April 22—26, Oslo, Norway
South Africa Sub-Committee	July 14—16, Upsala, Sweden
Commission on World Missions	July 20—27, Järvenpää, Finland
Commission on Liturgy	August 5—6, Strasbourg, France
Commission on Liturgy Commission on Theology	August 8—9, Strasbourg, France
Commission on Theology	August 10—13, Strasbourg, France
Commission on World Service	August 15—17, Yugoslavia, (place to be announced)
Committee on Latin America	August 20—21, Germany, (place to be announced)
LWF Africa Conference	Nov. 12—22, Marangu, Tanganyika

1956

Executive Committee Meeting	January 16—20, Madras, India
Commission on Stewardship and Congregational Life	March (exact date to be announced) Oslo, Norway

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Arvid Bäfverfeldt is director of the Church of Sweden Mission Society.

Hans Bolewski, director of the Department of Information, LWF.

Ragnar Bring, professor of Systematic Theology at the University of Lund. Among his works are: *Dualism in Luther* (1929, in Swedish), *Faith and Works in Lutheran Theology* (1933, in Swedish), *Law and Gospel, and the Third Use of the Law in Lutheran Theology* (1943, in German).

Heinz Brunotte, president of the chancellery of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD).

Earl S. Erb, executive secretary of the Board of Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America; member of the Division of Lutheran Co-operation in Latin America.

Heinz Flügel, resident lecturer at the Evangelical Academy at Tutzing, is the author of several German plays, including *Wölund* (1938), and *The Burning Hall* (1948), and Essays, including *Tragedy* (Tragik) *and Christianity* (1940), *History and Histories* (destinies) (1946), *Man and Son of Man* (1947). Heinz Flügel's thorough knowledge of Finnish language and literature has found expression in his *Finnish Journey* (1951), and in his German edition (1939) of *Kullerwo, a Finnish Epic.*

Gerhard Gloege is professor of Systematic Theology at Friedrich Schiller University, Jena. His special interests are Luther research and Lutheranism's problems concerning the state and social issues. His works include *Kingdom of God and Church in the New Testament* (1929), *The Gospel and the Present Time* (1949), *Zinzendorf and Lutheranism* (1950), *Myth and Lutheranism* (1952), all in German. He also translated Philip S. Watson's *Let God Be God* (1952).

Hanns Lilje, Bishop of Hannover, president of the LWF.

Carl E. Lund-Quist, executive secretary of the LWF.

Heinrich Meyer is the vice-chairman of the Commission on World Missions of the LWF.

Aino T. Nikolainen, professor of New Testament at the University of Helsinki, chairman of the Finnish Pastors' Association. Author of, among others, *The Concept of the Neighbor in the Old Testament* (1939), *The Human Problem in the Jewish and Hellenistic Environment of the New Testament* (1943), *Belief in Resurrection in the Bible and its World* (I 1944, II 1946).

Herbert Reich, pastor, Director of Publicity in the "Amt für Gemeindedienst" (Office of Parish Service) of the Church of Hannover.

Conrad M. Thompson, pastor, director of Evangelism for the Commission on Evangelism of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (ELC) in America.

Vilmos Vajta, director of the Department of Theology, LWF.

Gustaf Wingren, professor of Systematic Theology at the University of Lund, member of the Commission on Faith and Order and of its Working Committee. In addition, Professor Wingren was a member of the Consultative Commission for the Main Theme of Evanston. His published works include *Luther's Doctrine of Vocation* (1952, in German) and *Preaching* (1949, in Swedish).

(In the first issue of this journal we stated *erroneously* that Professor Wingren had been assistant to Dr. Lietzmann in Berlin and that he is a member of the Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches. - *Ed.*)

LUTHERAN WORLD

Official Publication of the

LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

Editorial Board:

Bishop Dr. Hanns Lilje, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, Bishop Johannes Smemo
Bishop Gerhard May, M. Charles Delbruck, Dr. Carl E. Lund-Quist

Editor:

The Rev. Dr. Hans Bolewski, Geneva, 17, route de Malagnou

Publishers:

Sonntagsblatt Inc., Jenischstr. 48, Hamburg-Kleinflottbek

Printers: Grindeldruck Inc., Grindelberg 13—17, Hamburg 13

The Lutheran World is a quarterly with an English and a German edition (German edition: Lutherische Rundschau)

Regular subscription rate for one year $ 1.75
Regular subscription rate for two years $ 3.00
Price of each copy $ 0.50 or its equivalent in local currencies

Orders can be sent directly to the publishers or

For the United States to: National Lutheran Council, 50 Madison Avenue, New York 10 / N. Y. (USA)

For Canada to: National Committee, 237 King Street W., Kitchener, Ontario (Canada)

For Australia to: Lutheran Book Depot, 19 O'Connel Street, North Adelaide / South Australia

or directly to: Department of Information, Lutheran World Federation, 17, route de Malagnou, Geneva/Switzerland

T. A. Kantonen

THE CHRISTIAN HOPE

One of America's outstanding theologians analyzes the central theme of the Evanston Assembly from the viewpoint of Christian beliefs in "last things." $1.50

G. Elson Ruff

THE DILEMMA OF CHURCH AND STATE

"Here is a soul-stirring book."
—*The Ministry*

". . . rich in insight . . . will stimulate thought."
—*The Pastor*

$1.50



at all book stores
MUHLENBERG PRESS · Philadelphia